



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

WIDENER LIBRARY



HX 1FJ8 7

Bv 308.39.15

**Harvard College Library**



**GIFT OF**

**JAMES STURGIS PRAY**

**CHARLES ELIOT PROFESSOR OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE**

**JULY 11, 1916**

**To be kept in the main collection of the  
College Library**

7 3

**James Sturgis May,**  
**Cambridge, Mass.**









THE  
HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO 1839.

BY

THOMAS KEIGHTLEY,  
AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORY OF GREECE," "HISTORY OF ROME,"  
"OUTLINES OF HISTORY," &c.

FROM THE SECOND LONDON EDITION.

WITH NOTES, &c.,

BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

IN FIVE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY HARPER & BROTHERS  
NO. 82 CLIFF-STREET.

---

1843

Bu 308.39.15

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

. GIFT OF

JAMES STURGIS PRAY

September 15, 1922

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1840, by  
HARPER & BROTHERS,  
In the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New York

**CONTENTS**  
**OF**  
**THE THIRD VOLUME.**

---

**HOUSE OF TUDOR,**  
**CONTINUED.**

**CHAPTER IX.**

**ELIZABETH.**

1558-1565.

**Accession of Elizabeth ; her Coronation.—The Reformation established.—Foreign Affairs.—Affairs of Scotland.—Return of Mary to Scotland.—Relative Situation of Elizabeth and Mary.—Suitors to the British Queens.—Mary and Darnley ; their Marriage.—Flight of Murray and his Friends . . . Page 7**

**CHAPTER X.**

**ELIZABETH (CONTINUED).**

1566-1571.

**Murder of Rizzio.—Mary's affection for Bothwell.—Murder of the King.—Proceedings in consequence of it.—Mary marries Bothwell.—Association of the Nobles.—Surrender of the Queen ; her Imprisonment and Abdication ; her Escape and Flight into England.—Conference at York and Hampton Court.—Proposed Marriage with the Duke of Norfolk.—Rising in the North.—Death and Character of the Regent Murray.—State of Politics.—Elizabeth excommunicated . . . . . 36**

**CHAPTER XI.**

**ELIZABETH (CONTINUED).**

1571-1587.

**Religious Parties.—Trial and Execution of Norfolk.—Massacre of St. Bartholomew ; its Consequences.—Sir Francis Drake.—Elizabeth's Coquetry with the Duke of Anjou.—Persecution of**

the Catholics.—Affairs of Scotland.—Danger of Elizabeth.—Dr. Parry.—The Queen aids the Dutch.—Babington's Conspiracy.—Trial of the Queen of Scots.—Conduct of Elizabeth.—Execution of the Queen of Scots.—Behaviour of Elizabeth after it . . . . . Page 61

## CHAPTER XII.

### ELIZABETH (CONTINUED).

1587-1603.

Conduct of the Kings of Scotland and France.—Philip prepares to invade England.—Preparations for Defence.—The Invincible Armada.—Death and Character of Leicester.—Affairs of France.—Naval Enterprises.—Taking of Cadiz.—State of Ireland.—Essex sent thither.—His Return, Insurrection, and Death.—The Queen's last Illness and Death.—Her Character.—Measures of her Reign . . . . . 104

## CHAPTER XII.

### ENGLAND UNDER THE TUDORS.

Power of the Crown.—House of Commons.—Court of Star Chamber.—Court of High Commission.—Wardship.—Younger Brothers.—Leigers or Resident Ambassadors . . . . . 130

## HOUSE OF STUART.—PART I.

### CHAPTER I.

#### JAMES I.

1603-1613.

Accession of James.—Bye and Surprise Plots.—Hampton Court Conference.—Gunpowder Plot.—Death of Salisbury; of Prince Henry.—Arabella Stuart . . . . . Page 137

### CHAPTER II.

#### JAMES I. (CONTINUED).

1613-1625.

Somerset and Lady Essex.—Sir Walter Raleigh.—The Elector Palatine.—Fall of Bacon.—The Spanish Match.—Prince of Wales in Spain.—Breach with the Court of Spain.—Death and Character of James.—Affairs of Ireland; of Scotland.—State of Religion.—Book of Sports . . . . . 163

## CONTENTS.

v

### CHAPTER III.

CHARLES I.

1625-1629.

King's Marriage.—First Parliament.—Expedition to Cadiz.—Impeachment of Buckingham.—Arbitrary Taxation.—War with France.—Expedition to Rochelle.—Petition of Right.—Murder of Buckingham.—Sir Thomas Wentworth.—Third Parliament.—Harsh Treatment of Sir John Eliot . . . . Page 188

### CHAPTER IV.

CHARLES I. (CONTINUED).

1629-1640.

The Cabinet.—Laud and the Church.—Persecution of Leighton, Prynne, and others.—Mode of Raising a Revenue.—Ship-money.—John Hampden.—Settlement of New-England.—Affairs of Scotland.—Attempt to introduce a Liturgy.—The Covenant.—The Episcopal War.—The Short Parliament.—Scots Enter England.—Despotism of Charles . . . . . 209

### CHAPTER V.

CHARLES I. (CONTINUED).

1640-1641.

The Long Parliament.—Impeachment and Trial of Strafford.—Army-plot.—Execution of Strafford.—Arts of the Popular Leaders . . . . . 232

### CHAPTER VI.

CHARLES I. (CONTINUED).

1641-1642.

Change of Ministry.—Army-petition.—Attacks on the Church.—Charles in Scotland.—The Incident.—The Irish Rebellion and Massacre.—Return of the King.—The Remonstrance.—Proceedings of the Parliament.—The Five Members.—Petitions to Parliament.—King retires to the North.—Encroachments of the Commons.—The Militia . . . . . 257

### CHAPTER VII.

CHARLES I. (CONTINUED).

1642-1644.

Gates of Hull shut against Charles.—Manifestoes on both sides.—Raising of Money and Troops.—Royal Standard raised at Nottingham

A 2



tingham.—Battle of Edgehill.—Affair at Brentford.—Treaty at  
 Oxford.—Arrival of the Queen.—Waller's Plot.—Battles of  
 Lansdown and Roundway-down.—Death and Character of  
 Hampden.—Surrender of Bristol.—Siege of Gloucester.—Bat-  
 tle of Newbury.—Ill conduct of the King.—Cessation with the  
 Irish Rebels.—Death and Character of Pym.—Oxford Parlia-  
 ment.—Progress of the War.—Battle of Cropredy Bridge.—  
 Battle of Marston Moor . . . . . Page 289

THE  
HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

---

HOUSE OF TUDOR,  
CONTINUED.

---

CHAPTER IX.\*

ELIZABETH.

1558-1565.

**Accession of Elizabeth; her Coronation.—The Reformation established.—Foreign Affairs.—Affairs of Scotland.—Return of Mary to Scotland.—Relative Situation of Elizabeth and Mary.—Suitors to the British Queens.—Mary and Darnley; their Marriage.—Flight of Murray and his Friends.**

ELIZABETH was proclaimed immediately after the death of her sister. Bonfires and illuminations testified the joy of the people, and their hopes of happier days. A deputation of the council repaired the next day to Hatfield, to convey to the new queen the tidings of her accession. She fell on her knees and said, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." Acting under the advice of Sir William Cecil, who had long been in communication with her, she declared her intention of continuing most of the late queen's counsellors in their offices.† The necessary regulations were forthwith made respecting public affairs, and on the 23d the queen set out for London.

\* Authorities: Camden and the Chroniclers; Burnet, Strype, &c.

† Those whom she retained (who of course were Catholics)

She was met at Highgate by the bishops ; to all of whom, except Bonner, she gave a gracious reception. She remained that night at the Charter House, the residence of Lord North, and proceeded the next day (November 25th) to the Tower. The thoughts of the change in her condition since she entered that royal fortress a prisoner, awoke her religious feelings, and she fell on her knees and returned thanks to God.

One of the earliest measures was to send information to foreign princes of the death of the late and the accession of the present queen. Lord Cobham was appointed to convey the tidings to King Philip, expressing at the same time the queen's gratitude for the friendship he had shown her during the late reign. Philip, in return, through his ambassador, the Duke of Feria, offered his hand to Elizabeth, assuring her that he would obtain the requisite dispensation from Rome. But every motive, both public and private, operated in the queen's mind against this match. The nation was so adverse to the Spanish connexion, that, by continuing it, she would forfeit her popularity ; and as Philip and she were related in the same degree as her father and Catharine of Aragon had been, such an alliance would be, in effect, acknowledging that her mother's marriage was not valid, and that her own birth was not legitimate. She therefore declined the proposed union in the most civil terms.

Her accession was also notified at Rome ; but the passionate old man then pope indignantly replied, that, as England was a fief of the Holy See, it was great presumption in her to assume the title and authority of queen ; and that, being illegitimate, she could not inherit ; furthermore, if, however, she would renounce all title to the crown and submit entirely to his will, she should be treated with all the lenity consistent

were Archbishop Heath, chancellor ; Marquis Winchester, treasurer ; Earls Arundel, Shrewsbury, Derby, Pembroke ; Lords Clinton and Howard of Effingham ; Sirs T. Cheyney, W. Petre, J. Mason, Rich, Sackville ; and Dr. Boxall. To these she added the following Protestants : Marquis Northampton, Earl Bedford ; Sirs T. Parry, E. Rogers, A. Cave, F. Knolles, W. Cecil, N. Bacon.

with the dignity of the Holy See. These arrogant assumptions were of no effect; Elizabeth little heeded the authority of the pontiff, and she had commenced the changes she intended in religion long before his answer could arrive.

The prudence of Elizabeth, and of her chief adviser, Cecil, led them to proceed very cautiously. The first step was to put an end to the persecution; those, therefore, who were in prison for their religion were released on their own recognisances.

The late queen's obsequies were performed according to the rites of the Romish church, on the 15th of December. White, bishop of Winchester, preached the funeral sermon; but, as he took occasion to deliver an inflammatory discourse, he received an order to keep his house. When intelligence arrived, on the 23d of December, of the death of the Emperor Charles V., a solemn dirge and requiem were ordered to be performed for the repose of his soul; but Elizabeth forbade the host to be elevated in her own chapel, and also directed a part of the service to be performed in English. Many of the Reformers had already returned from exile and were favourably received at court; but preaching was prohibited without the royal license. Archbishop Heath, seeing the course matters were taking, resigned the seals, which were committed to Sir Nicholas Bacon, with the title of lord-keeper.

The 15th of January, 1559, was the day appointed for the coronation. On the 14th the queen left the Tower and proceeded through the city in a splendid carriage, preceded by trumpeters and heralds, and followed by a train of nobles, ladies, and gentlemen on horseback, all richly attired in crimson velvet. The shouts of the joyous multitudes filled the air as she passed along; and the companies of the city displayed their feelings and taste, in the manner of the age, by erecting gorgeous *pageants*, as they were named, across the streets. On one appeared the eight Beatitudes, suitably habited; each of the virtues so personified being appropriately ascribed to the queen. At the conduit in Cheapside, another exhibited the

opposite images of a decayed and a flourishing commonwealth; from a cave beneath issued Time, leading forth his daughter Truth, who presented an English Bible to the queen. Elizabeth took the book, pressed it to her heart and lips, and said she thanked the city more for it than for all the cost that had been bestowed on her, and that she should often read it over. At the end of Cheapside the recorder met her, and presented her with a purse containing 1000 marks in gold, which weighty gift she received in both her hands. The giants Gog and Magog reared their huge forms over Temple Bar, holding out to her Latin verses; and a child, "richly arrayed as a poet," pronounced a welcome in the name of the corporation of London.

The coronation took place the next day. Heath and some of the other bishops did not appear: but the greater part were in attendance, arrayed in scarlet like the temporal nobles; and the ceremony was performed in the usual manner by Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle. It being usual on such occasions to release prisoners, on the following morning, as the queen was on her way to her chapel, one of the courtiers presented to her a petition, beseeching that now, in this good time, five illustrious prisoners might be set free: viz., the four Evangelists and St. Paul, who had been long shut up in an unknown tongue, so that they could not converse with the common people. She replied, with great gravity, that it were better first to inquire of themselves whether they would have their liberty or not.

The queen was at this time twenty-five years of age. In person she was above the middle size, well-formed and majestic. Her skin was fair, her hair yellow inclining to red, her eyes bright and lively, and her nose somewhat aquiline. Her manners were affable, dignified, and graceful, and her mind was highly cultivated; she could express herself with elegance and ease in Latin, French, and Italian;\* and in the

\* Her studies had been directed by the learned Roger Ascham, who was naturally vain of the accomplishments of his royal pupil,

school of adversity she had learned wisdom. Such was the woman whose destiny it now was to sway the British sceptre.

On the 25th the parliament met. The same causes, namely, influence on the part of the government, the zeal of its friends and the depression of its enemies, which had given a popish parliament in the beginning of the late reign, now returned one equally zealous for the Reformation. Its first act was a recognition of Elizabeth as the "lawful, undoubted, and true heir to the crown, lawfully descended of the blood-royal," according to the order of succession settled by the 35th statute of Henry VIII. The queen, in all things superior to her predecessor, did not, like her, ostentatiously seek a declaration of the validity of her mother's marriage, and thus throw obloquy on her father, and revive the memory of events that were better forgotten. All that was requisite was implied in the words "lawfully descended of the blood-royal." Bills for restoring the tenths and first-fruits to the crown, and for re-establishing the supremacy, were introduced and carried, in spite of the strenuous opposition of the bishops. By the last, the queen, who was styled Governess (not Head) of the Church, was invested with the whole spiritual power to make or repeal canons, alter discipline and ceremonies, suppress heresies, etc., without consulting parliament or convocation. Whoever refused to acknowledge the supremacy was declared incapable of holding office; while any one who denied it, or sought to deprive the queen of it, was to forfeit his goods and chattels for the first offence, to incur a *præmunire* for the second, and for the third, the pains and penalties of treason. The queen was to nominate directly to vacant bishoprics, and the bishops were forbidden to alienate the revenues of their sees, or to make leases for more than twenty-one years. But, as an exception was

and declared of her that she was the most lettered lady in England, not excepting even Jane Grey and Margaret Roper. In addition to the languages here mentioned, it is said that she was also familiar with the Greek.—*Am. Ed.*

made in favour of the crown, the church derived but little advantage from this well-intended measure.

A bill for restoring the English liturgy was next brought in: but the matter was considered of so much importance, that it was deemed advisable it should be previously discussed between the two religious parties. Eight champions were accordingly chosen on each side: the most distinguished of the Romanists were bishops White and Watson, Dean Cole, and Archdeacon Harpsfield; and of the Protestants, Scurry, Jewel, Aylmer, Cox, Grindal, and Horne. The Archbishop of York and the Lord-keeper Bacon presided; and the place of the controversy was Westminster Abbey. The questions proposed were, Whether it is not against the Word of God, and the custom of the ancient church, to use an unknown language in the public service of the church; whether every church has not a right to appoint rites and ceremonies, so it be done to edification; and, lastly, whether it can be proved from Scripture that there is a propitiatory sacrifice in the mass?

On Friday, the 31st of March, the disputation began, in the presence of the privy council and both houses of parliament. Though it was to be conducted in writing, and ten days' notice had been given, the Romish party said that they had nothing written prepared, alleging want of time: but offered to advance some extemporary arguments in favour of the retention of a foreign language. Their motives for so acting were sufficiently obvious; nevertheless, their offer was accepted. Dean Cole then rose, well provided with previously prepared notes; and, prompted by his colleagues, delivered some of the weak arguments by which this absurd practice is defended, well seasoned with abuse of the Reformers. He concluded by observing that nothing was more inexpedient than to bring religious rites down to the level of the vulgar: for *ignorance*, said he, *is the mother of devotion*. An able reply was read by Dr. Horne, which drew forth great applause. The Romanists alleging that they had farther arguments to urge, the controversy was

adjourned to the following Monday, on which day they raised various objections. They refused to begin the debate; alleging that the Protestants would have the advantage by speaking last; the assembly therefore broke up; White and Watson were committed to the Tower for contempt, and three other bishops and three of their divines were heavily fined, in conformity with the arbitrary mode of proceeding which extended to all matters in that age.

The Act of Uniformity, as it is styled, was now introduced and passed: the bishops and eight temporal peers alone dissenting. This act directs that King Edward's second service-book, as altered by the committee of divines appointed for the purpose, should alone be read. The penalties imposed on ministers who should use any other service were, forfeiture of goods and chattels for the first offence, a year's imprisonment for the second, and imprisonment for life for the third. A fine of one shilling was imposed on all who should absent themselves from church on Sundays and holydays.

The Reformation was thus finally and effectually established. The parliament concluded its labours by the grant of a subsidy, followed by a respectful but urgent address to the queen, praying her to make choice of a husband. She thanked them for their zeal, but assured them that she regarded herself as solemnly espoused to her kingdom at her coronation, that she viewed her subjects as her children, and that she desired no fairer remembrance of her to go down to posterity than this inscription on her tomb: "Here lies Elizabeth, who lived and died a maiden queen."

The new liturgy came into use on St. John the Baptist's day.\* The oath of supremacy was tendered to the bishops and clergy. Of the prelates, Kitchen of Llandaff alone would take it:† the others were consequently deprived of their sees, as were also about one hundred dignitaries and eighty parish priests: but

\* The 24th of June.

† The whole number of bishops then alive was fifteen; fourteen consequently were displaced for declining the oath.—*Am. Ed.*



the great body of the clergy took the oath without hesitation. No fires were kindled for the recusants : they remained at full liberty, till, in the following winter, they began to attack the Reformation openly. For this several of them were committed to prison. Bonner was confined in the Marshalsea, where he remained for the rest of his life, indulging to the last in the pleasures of the table, to which he was passionately addicted.\* Tunstall passed the short remnant of his days at Lambeth, where he met with every attention ; the same palace was the domicil of Thirlby ; Bourne was sent to reside with the Dean of Exeter ; and Heath spent the remainder of his life on his estate at Cobham, in Surrey, where the queen often visited him. Some died and others went abroad. The places of the deprived prelates were supplied by the most eminent Protestant divines. Dr. Matthew Parker, a man of great learning and piety, who had been chaplain to the queen's mother, was selected for the see of Canterbury, and was consecrated on the 17th of December by four of the bishops who had been deprived in the late reign.

Having thus brought the domestic affairs of the country to the close of the first year of Elizabeth's reign, we will now turn our attention to its foreign relations.

The late queen had left to her successor the legacy of a war with both France and Scotland : but negotiations for a general peace had been commenced at Cernamp, and were now continued at Chateau-Cambresis. The differences between the kings of France and Spain were easily arranged : but Philip, as in honour bound, insisted on the restitution of Calais to his English ally. To this the French cabinet was by no

\* It is stated that the queen, at her first audience, courteously received all the bishops except Bonner, and from him she turned away with an expression of the strongest aversion. So great was the general indignation against this bloodstained prelate, that, on his death in 1569, as related by Grindal, it was thought necessary that his remains should be secretly interred by night, to preserve them from the violence of the people.—*Am. Ed.*

means disposed to assent; and Philip's zeal cooled when he found he had no longer any prospect of the queen's hand. He, however, offered to continue the war on account of it, provided she would engage not to make peace for six years. But, to the prudence of Elizabeth and her ministers, the possession of Calais, even if it could be recovered, seemed so inadequate to the cost likely to be incurred, that they rejected the proposal, and the English envoys were directed to make peace on any reasonable terms. It was therefore agreed that the French king should retain Calais for eight years; and that, if he did not then restore it, he should pay 500,000 crowns, and the queen's title should remain: but that if, during that time, Elizabeth made war on France or Scotland, she should forfeit Calais, which, on the other hand, Henry should give up immediately if he were the first to break the peace. It was plain that this was only a decent pretext for abandoning Calais; and the judicious saw in it grounds for admiring the queen's good sense and prudence. A general peace was thus, on the 2d of April, concluded; and Philip, giving up all thoughts of the Queen of England, married the French king's daughter Elizabeth, who had been betrothed to his son Don Carlos.

A difference, however, of no small moment still existed between Elizabeth and the King of France. Following the unnatural practice then so common,\* he had caused the dauphin and the Queen of Scotland to be married in 1558, though the prince had not then passed his fifteenth year; and, on the death of Mary, he made them assume the arms of England: for, according to the papal edict, Elizabeth was illegitimate, and the Queen of Scots was consequently the next heir on the hereditary principle. When Elizabeth's ambassadors complained, it was replied that Elizabeth styled herself Queen of France; and that the Scottish queen, as being of the blood-royal of England, had a

\* Mrs. Hutchinson (Life of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 26, 4to edit.) relates of one of the Byron family, that he was married so young, that, "when the first child was born, the father, mother, and child could not make one-and-thirty years old."

right to bear its arms. But this was all mere evasion. The quartering of the arms of France with those of England was no new device of Elizabeth's, and, at most, it could only be regarded as a piece of national vanity: whereas the act of the dauphin and queen, as it had not been done in Mary's reign, evidently showed an intention of disputing the throne of England with Elizabeth.\* The settlement of this point, however, was reserved, and the young royal pair signed, as parties, the peace of Chateau-Cambresis.

Elizabeth was fully aware that it was the secret intention of the court of France to endeavour to make good the claim of Mary of Scotland to the crown of England. She knew that application had been made at Rome to have her, Elizabeth, excommunicated, which had been prevented only by the influence of King Philip; and as it was believed that her own *Catholic* subjects would aid her rival, policy suggested the expediency of forming a connexion with Mary's *Protestant* subjects. Hence arose the great interest taken by the court of England in the internal affairs of Scotland. It is necessary, therefore, to enter somewhat minutely into the history of that country at the present juncture.

The moderate temper of the Queen-regent of Scotland made her indisposed to persecution. The Reformed doctrines, therefore, gradually advanced; and

\* The Scottish queen and her husband even went so far as to assume the title of King and Queen of England in their public documents, according to Robinson; and had the arms of that kingdom engraved on their coin and plate, and constantly bore them, as though they had an undoubted right so to do. Under their armorial bearings were four lines in French, which Strype, in his "Annals of Queen Elizabeth," has translated into the following doggerel verse.

"The arms of Mary, Queen-dauphiness of France,  
The noblest lady in earth for till advance,  
Of Scotland queen and of England, also  
Of France, as God hath providet it so."

See Robertson's History of Scotland, p. 73, Harpers' edition.—*Am. Ed.*

many of those who had fled from the tyranny of the late fanatic Queen of England, found a refuge in the northern kingdom. There is a sternness in the Scottish character unknown to the English, and nowhere is this more strikingly manifested than in the different course taken by the Reformation in the two countries. In England it was conducted with great moderation, merely cutting off superfluities, and abolishing unscriptural rites and practices ; in Scotland it was carried on in a very different spirit ; and, while the English Protestants only sought toleration from their bigoted queen, their Scottish brethren would be content with nothing short of the utter subversion of the old religion. On the 3d of December, 1557, their leaders, the earls of Argyle, Morton, and Glencairn, and other nobles, met at Edinburgh and entered into a private association, styled the Congregation of the Lord, binding themselves to struggle to the utmost against "Satan in his members, the antichrist of their time." This convention remained for some time a secret. In the mean while, the primate Hamilton seized a priest named Mill, and had him tried and condemned for heresy at St. Andrew's : but it was with difficulty a civil judge could be got to pronounce sentence on him ; on the day of the execution the shops were all shut ; no one would sell a rope to tie him to the stake, and the primate was finally obliged to furnish one himself. Mill died with constancy ; the people raised a pile of stones on the spot in commemoration of him, which the clergy caused to be removed ; but still the pile was rebuilt. Soon after, when the image of St. Giles, the patron saint of Edinburgh, was carried in procession, the people, as soon as the queen-regent withdrew, fell on and drove off the priests, seized the image, threw it in the mire, and broke it in pieces.

The lords of the Congregation, imboldened by these decided indications of the popular feeling, and by the tidings of the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth, ventured to petition the regent for the reformation of the church, and of the "scandalous lives" of the prelates and clergy. The regent temporized

till she had obtained the matrimonial crown for the dauphin, and might then have conceded some of their demands, had she not received directions from her brothers, the Guises (who now controlled everything at the court of France), to check the new opinions. As usual, she submitted implicitly to their will ; and the principal Reformed teachers were cited before the council at Stirling. Such numbers of their followers came to protect them that she feared an insurrection : but on a promise, it is said, that no harm should befall their ministers, they dispersed. Sentence, however, was passed against them as rebels on their disappearance,\* and the enraged people now resolved on opposing the regent and the Romish clergy with arms.

While matters were in this state, the celebrated John Knox returned to Scotland. Knox, a man of stern, unbending nature, actuated by principle alone, far above all sordid, selfish considerations, but tinctured with the illiberal spirit of the times, and not deeply learned, had adopted, in their full extent, the principles of Calvin, the apostle of Geneva. Gospel truth (as embraced in these principles) he held to be paramount to every other consideration, and that all the laws of society should yield before it. Hence he was found to vindicate even the murder of Cardinal Beaton.† This daring man, on the 11th of May, ascended the pulpit at Perth, and poured forth a torrent of declamation against the tenets and practices of the church of Rome. When he had concluded, a priest

\* This was in accordance with a detestable principle too often acted on by despotic rulers, and which this princess had the imprudent boldness afterward to avow, that "the promises of princes should not be too carefully remembered, nor the performance of them exacted, unless it suits their own convenience."—*Am. Ed.*

† This individual had been surprised and slain by a party of sixteen men, headed by Norman Lesly, son of the Earl of Rothes, in his own castle of St. Andrew's. Lesly was instigated to the commission of this deed by private revenge for personal injuries received from the cardinal ; though doubtless the passions both of himself and followers had been much excited by the religious phrensy of the times.—*Am. Ed.*

had the hardihood to prepare to celebrate mass : but the people, who had been wrought up to a high degree of excitement by the eloquence of Knox, rushed forward, seized and destroyed the implements, tore the pictures, broke the images, and overthrew the altars. They then proceeded, their numbers increasing as they went, to the convents of the Gray, Black, and White Friars, whence they drove out the inmates, and pillaged and destroyed the buildings. The same thing was done at Cupar, in Fife, which was reformed, as the phrase was, in a similar manner.

The regent, on receiving the intelligence, advanced with what troops she had towards Perth. She was joined by Arran (now Duke of Chatelherault in France), Argyle, James Stuart, prior of St. Andrew's, and other lords of the Reformed party, while Glencairn and others led their retainers to the support of the Congregation. They were so formidable in numbers and evinced so determined a spirit, that the regent, dubious of the event of a conflict, agreed to an accommodation. She was then admitted into Perth. But it was not long before she perfidiously violated the conditions ;\* whereupon the Congregation, now joined by Argyle and the prior, again took up arms ; Knox became their animating spirit, and Anstruther, Scone, Stirling, and other places, were reformed as Perth had been. They advanced to Edinburgh, where they were admitted by the people, who had already reformed their city. The queen took refuge at Dunbar : but the usual causes having acted to increase her strength and to diminish that of her adversaries, a new accommodation was agreed to, and on the 12th of July she regained possession of Edinburgh. Soon after troops came from France to her support, and she stationed them at Leith, which she had fortified.

Henry II. of France, having lost his life by an accident at the tournament celebrated in honour of his sis-

\* She introduced a French garrison into Perth, fined or banished the most obnoxious citizens, displaced the magistrates, and forbade the exercise of any religion except the Roman Catholic, all of which was in direct violation of her solemn promises.—*Am. Ed.*

ter's marriage with the Duke of Savoy, was succeeded by the dauphin, under the title of Francis II., and the power of the Guises was now without limits. The young sovereigns styled themselves King and Queen of England. The design of making Scotland, and eventually England, a dependency of France, and of putting down the Reformation, was still retained. Additional troops were collected to be sent to the former kingdom. The Congregation saw, therefore, that, unless supported by England, they ran the risk of being crushed; and they accordingly sent Maitland of Lethington and Robert Melvill secretly to London. Cecil stated to his royal mistress various reasons which he said not only justified, but rendered imperative on her the support of the applicants. Her scruples about treating with the subjects of another prince gave way, and she concluded a treaty with the lords of the Congregation, solemnly promising never to desist till the French should evacuate Scotland. Admiral Winter was sent with a fleet of fifteen sail to the Frith of Forth, and an army of eight thousand men was assembled on the borders.

The French troops had surprised Stirling, and were laying Fifeshire waste, when the appearance of Winter's fleet forced them to return to Leith, where they were besieged by the Congregationalists.\* A treaty for peace was now set on foot at Newcastle, whither Elizabeth sent Cecil and Wotton to meet the French ministers. While it was in progress the queen-regent died, on the 11th of June, 1560. The negotiation was then removed to Edinburgh, and it was finally agreed that the French should evacuate Scotland; that twelve persons, seven to be selected by the queen and five by the parliament, should govern the kingdom; and

\* During this siege the queen-regent died, of whom Robertson says, that "she outlived in a great measure that reputation and popularity which had smoothed her way to the highest station in the kingdom; and by many examples of falsehood and some of severity, in the latter part of her administration, alienated from her the affections of a people who had once placed in her an unbounded confidence."—*Am. Ed.*

that war or peace should not be made without the consent of the parliament. By a separate treaty with Elizabeth, Francis and Mary were to renounce the title of king and queen of England. These princes, however, refused to ratify the treaty, under pretext that the Scots had not fulfilled the conditions, and that Elizabeth continued to support them.

In France itself, at this time, the Protestants formed a numerous party: their heads were the Prince of Condé, the Admiral Coligni and his brother Andelot. The persecution against them, which had been begun by Francis I., was still kept up; and, from the furious bigotry of the Guises, it was likely to be aggravated. Community of interest naturally made them look to the Queen of England; and Throgmorton, her ambassador, entered into communication with them. An attempt was made to seize the young king at Amboise; but it failed, and the hopes of the Reformers were crushed for a time. The aspect of affairs in France, however, soon underwent a considerable change. Francis, who was a puny, delicate youth, died on the 5th of December, and the queen-dowager, Catharine de' Medici, became regent for the minority of her son Charles IX.; the King of Navarre, whom the Guises had thrown into prison, was liberated, and made lieutenant-general of the kingdom; the Prince of Condé, who had been condemned to death, was also set at liberty; the Constable Montmorenci was recalled to court, and a counterpoise to the power of the Guises was thus formed.

The widowed queen, finding the court where she had ruled no longer an agreeable abode, retired to that of her uncles in Lorraine. She still persevered in refusing to ratify the treaty with Elizabeth. Her subjects sent, entreating her to return to her own kingdom; and her uncles urged her to the same course: but the ill feeling which prevailed between her and the queen-mother assured her that she could never expect happiness in France. She therefore consented to a departure; and her minister, D'Oysell, was sent to England to ask a safe passage for himself and



his royal mistress to Scotland. Elizabeth received him in the presence of her whole court; and, in a tone of strong emotion, refused both requests, unless the treaty of Edinburgh were first ratified. "Let your queen," said she, "ratify the treaty, and she shall experience on my part, either by sea or by land, whatever can be expected from a queen, a relation, or a neighbour." When Mary was informed of this refusal, she remonstrated in very spirited terms with Throgmorton against the conduct of Elizabeth. Another envoy, however, was sent to London; and, as Mary intimated her intentions of being guided by the advice of her council in Scotland, Elizabeth declared herself content to "suspend her conceit of unkindness;" and, in answer to the report that was made of her having sent a fleet to intercept her, she assured her that she had only, at the desire of the King of Spain, sent two or three small barks to sea in pursuit of some Scottish pirates.

Mary, accompanied by her uncles, and many lords and ladies of the court of France, now proceeded to Calais, where she embarked on the 14th of August, 1561. Just as she was leaving the harbour, a vessel was lost in her sight. "Mercy," cried she, "what an omen for a voyage!" She stood leaning with both arms on the poop, and the tears streamed from her eyes as she regarded the country she was leaving. She continually repeated, "Farewell, France! farewell, France!" When it was growing dark and she was summoned down to supper, her tears flowed still more plenteously; and she cried, "It is now, my dear France, that I lose sight of thee; I shall never see thee more." A bed was prepared for her on the poop; and she directed the pilot to awake her at day-break if the coast of France should be still in sight. The man called her as she had desired. She gazed on the distant coast till it sunk from her view. "Farewell, France," said she; "it is over; I shall never see thee more." The English squadron met and saluted her. It searched the baggage ships for pirates, and detained one that was suspected.\* On the third day

\* A very different account of this matter is given by other his

a dense fog came on, which obliged them to cast anchor in the open sea ; and the next day the queen landed at Leith. Though she came before the appointed time, and due preparations had not, therefore, been made to receive her, the people crowded down to the port to evince their loyalty : but the queen and her retinue could procure no better conveyance to the palace of Holyrood than the paltry horses of the country, and these ill caparisoned. "Are these," cried she, "the poms, the splendours, and the superb animals on which I used to ride in France?" In the evening a concert of barbarous and discordant music, performed before her windows to testify the joy of her subjects, grated the ears of Mary and her French attendants.

The young queen was now in her nineteenth year. Her person was tall and elegant, and her face handsome, if not beautiful.\* Her abilities were considerable, and her manners highly polished. She had been brought up in a court where the serpent but too often lurked among the roses : where treachery, falsehood, and cruelty lay hid beneath the covert of honeyed words and wreathed smiles ; and where dissoluteness of manners prevailed to a degree elsewhere unknown. She had been reared, too, in a bigoted adherence to the tenets and practices of Rome. She had come, on the contrary, to a country poor and semi-barbarous, where deeds of violence and treachery were openly enacted ; where the Reformation breathed its sternest spirit, as yet but little mitigated by the Gospel precepts of peace and charity ; where the reformed clergy, led by the rigid Knox, denounced the masks,

torians, and Elizabeth is openly charged with having sent out this squadron for the express purpose of intercepting the Scottish queen, and bringing her to England ; which, it is said, was prevented only by a fog which very opportunely arose, and prevented the French vessels from being seen by the English.—See Bell's *Life of Mary Queen of Scots*, i., 96, *et. seq.*, Harpers' edition.—*Am. Ed.*

\* We express ourselves thus, because, in some undoubtedly genuine portraits of Mary, her face is not by any means what<sup>w</sup> should consider beautiful.

the dances, and the banquets in which the queen took delight, as sinful abominations.

Between a sovereign and people of such opposite characters, long-continued harmony could hardly be expected to prevail. Yet Mary's reign was for some years happy and prosperous. For this she was indebted to her following the advice of her uncles, and giving her confidence to her half-brother, the prior of St. Andrew's, whom she raised to the dignity of Earl of Mar, and soon after to that of Moray or Murray, who was the head of the Protestant party, and a man of honour, probity, and ability. She also held occasional conferences with Knox,\* and bore his uncourteous animadversions with no little patience. Yet all the while her fixed design was the overthrow of the Reformed religion.† In 1562, when some zealous Reformers presented a petition for the suppression of the Romish worship, she angrily replied, that she hoped, before another year, to have the mass restored throughout the kingdom. On the 10th of May in the following year, 1563, her uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, read her letters to the council of Trent, professing her submission to its authority, and promising, if she succeeded to the throne of England, to subject both kingdoms to the Holy See. We are farther assured that she was a subscribing party to the famous Holy League, concluded at Bayonne in 1565, for the extermination of the Protestants. It is not possible that the intentions of Mary with respect to religion could

\* The conversation which passed between the queen and the Scottish Reformer on one of these occasions is given at length by M'Crie in his *Life of Knox*, and is not a little curious, as strikingly exhibiting the different characters of the two.—See also Bell's *Life of Mary*, i., 125, *et seq.*, Harpers' Family Library.—*Am. Ed.*

† This is as positively denied by the friends of Mary as it is asserted by her enemies. So contradictory, in fact, are the statements and opinions advanced by different writers, as they chance to be biased for or against this celebrated queen, that it is extremely difficult in all cases to know what to believe. Her youth, and beauty, and accomplishments, and still more her misfortunes, have thrown a romantic interest about her life and character, and enlisted feelings but little favourable either to impartial investigation or the honest avowal of truth.—*Am. Ed.*

have escaped the knowledge of Elizabeth and her wise minister Cecil; and was it not their duty, it may be asked, to guard against her having the power to carry these designs into effect?

The Queen of Scots, we have seen, laid claim to the throne of England; and, supposing the divorce of Henry VIII. not to have been legal, and the power of parliament to limit the succession not paramount, her claim was irresistible. The Romanists generally took this view of the case. On the other hand, Henry, by his will, sanctioned by parliament, devised the crown, after his own children, to the issue of his younger sister, the Queen of France, by the Duke of Suffolk; and many of the Protestants, such as Cecil and Bacon, favoured this line. The general feeling, however, was on the side of the elder or Scottish branch; and Elizabeth herself seems to have viewed the Queen of Scots as her true heir, though she was probably secretly determined to keep the matter in uncertainty as long as she lived. By an act of great harshness and even cruelty, she at this time put it nearly out of her own power to exclude the Queen of Scots.

The Lady Catharine Grey, next sister to the Lady Jane, had been married to the son of the Earl of Pembroke: but, on the fall of her family, that time-serving nobleman caused them to be divorced. Catharine was afterward privately married to the Earl of Hertford, son of the Protector; which being discovered, Elizabeth sent them both to the Tower; and, as they were unable to prove their marriage, the primate pronounced a divorce. Hertford was heavily fined, and detained in prison till his unhappy wife sank under the ill treatment which she received, and died. The legitimacy of their two children was acknowledged in a subsequent reign.

Shortly after her arrival in Scotland Mary sent Maitland of Lethington to Elizabeth to propose a friendly alliance, but at the same time requiring to be declared successor to the throne of England. Elizabeth insisted on the execution of the treaty of Edinburgh; and declared that, in such case, she would do

nothing to prejudice the rights of Mary : but she said that her own experience, when she was at Hatfield, had convinced her how dangerous to the present possessor of power it was to have a designated successor, who would thus become a rallying-point for the disaffected.\* This was a subject on which, through her whole reign, Elizabeth was remarkably jealous ; and though, as we have said, she secretly favoured the hereditary principle, she never would openly declare herself. The two queens, notwithstanding, kept up an amicable intercourse by letters ; and at one time proposed a personal interview at York, which, however, did not take place, in consequence of Elizabeth's vanity and jealousy, according to those writers who take delight in assigning unworthy motives to the actions of this great princess. To us the conduct of Elizabeth towards Mary at this period seems to have been as cordial as was consistent with her station as the head of the Protestant party in Great Britain, and the obstinate retention by the Scottish queen of her claim to the crown of England.

It was a curious circumstance, that the rulers of the two British kingdoms should be both young women, both handsome, and both single. Their hands were therefore naturally objects of ambition to foreign princes, and the disposal of them a matter of no small solicitude to their subjects. The English parliament were particularly anxious that their sovereign should marry ; as her having issue would secure a Protestant succession, and preclude the collision which might ensue between the hereditary claims of the descendants of Margaret, and the parliamentary title of those of Mary Tudor, the daughters of Henry VII. But the masculine and arbitrary temper of Elizabeth had early

\* About the end of the year 1566, Elizabeth said to the French ambassador, "There are two things in the way of a full reconciliation with the Queen of Scots : 1st. That she will not confess that she has offended me ; 2d. That she is about, as I foresee, to demand of me somewhat which I cannot grant, because it is more dangerous and pernicious to me than it is convenient and advantageous to her."—*Rassier, Hist. of 16th and 17th Centuries*, ii., 92.

brought her to a secret determination never to give herself a master; and, though she amused her parliament with fair words, and coquetted with some of her suiters, there does not appear to be any reason for supposing that she seriously thought of marriage. The following were the principal suiters of the English queen at this time.

When Philip of Spain had given up all hopes of obtaining the hand of Elizabeth for himself, he put forward the pretensions of his cousin Charles, archduke of Austria, with the design of counterbalancing the influence of France in the British island. Some of Elizabeth's leading nobles were strongly in favour of this match, and it continued for some years to be the subject of discussion. Eric king of Sweden, Adolf duke of Holstein, and some other princes, also sought her hand. The Scottish parliament, in 1560, prayed her to marry the Earl of Arran. Catharine de' Medici, at a later period, offered her son, the Duke of Anjou, to the English queen.

The females of the royal family of England had at all times matched with subjects, and we have seen the parliament petition the late queen to marry a subject. It need not surprise us, therefore, to find nobles aspiring to the hand of Elizabeth. The Earl of Arundel, though several years her senior, long cherished hopes; and Sir William Pickering, a man possessed of beauty of person, a cultivated mind, and great taste in the arts, was for some time thought to stand high in the favour of the maiden queen. But all were eclipsed by the attractions of Lord Robert Dudley.

Dudley was son to the infamous Northumberland. He had been committed to the Tower with the rest of his family, but was early set at liberty; and, by the graces of his manners and his ready assiduity, he won the favour of both Philip and Mary, by whom he was frequently employed. At Elizabeth's entrance into London he appeared in her train as master of the horse, and wealth and honours were gradually showered on him. Dudley, we must observe, was at this

time a married man, having espoused Amy, the heiress of Sir John Robsart; nor does there appear to have been anything serious or wrong in the motives of Elizabeth. With all her dignity and greatness of mind, she was by nature a coquette; she loved admiration, and she had inherited her father's partiality for handsome attendants. Like him, too, she was apt to indulge in a coarse, and, what might seem at the present day, an indelicate familiarity in language and action, which malicious minds could easily misinterpret. Moreover, at this time she had not the remotest thought of marrying.

Of this Dudley was probably not aware; and he may have thought that his wife was the only obstacle to his gaining the hand of the queen. This throws great suspicion over the death of that lady, which occurred at this time (1560). He sent her (on what account is not known), under the charge of Sir Richard Verney, one of his retainers, to a mansion named Cumnor Hall, in Berkshire, held by another of his dependants, named Anthony Foster. Her death took place shortly after, owing, it was said, to an accidental fall down stairs. Suspicions of foul play naturally arose; and Lever, a prebendary of Coventry, a pious minister who resided near the place, wrote to secretaries Cecil and Knowles, praying that inquiry might be made. Whether this took place or not, we have no certain information: but Dudley appears to have been fully cleared in the queen's mind, though by his enemies and the public he continued to be in some sort "infamed for the death of his wife," as Cecil expresses it.

The hand of the other British queen was also sought by many. The Archduke Charles was a suitor to her also; Philip offered her his son Don Carlos; and the King of Navarre would, it is said, willingly have divorced his Protestant queen, Jane d'Albret, to marry the Queen of Scotland, to whom Catharine proposed a union with another of her sons. Some of the petty princes of Italy also aspired to the widowed queen.

Mary, however, was differently situated from Elizabeth: the latter had only her own inclinations to consult, while, from the circumstance of differing in religion from the great bulk of her subjects, who looked up to Elizabeth as their protectress, Mary could not safely venture on any match which did not meet the approbation of that princess, who, as well as the Scottish Reformers, was extremely adverse to her marrying any one but a Protestant. It was a delicate matter for Elizabeth to manage, as it seemed an almost unwarrantable interference in the concerns of an independent sovereign. Still the safety of England and of the Protestant religion was paramount to all other considerations. In November, 1563, Cecil drew up instructions on this subject for Randolph, the English minister at Edinburgh, in which he stated the reasons which he considered should influence Mary in her choice, viz., the mutual affection of the parties, the approval of her own subjects, and the friendship of Elizabeth, who, he said, would not be satisfied with a foreign match. He was desired to hint, that "nothing would content Elizabeth so much as Mary's choice of some noble person within the kingdom of England, having the qualities and conditions meet for such an alliance,\* and therefore be agreeable to both queens and both their nations." Accordingly, Randolph suggested Lord Robert Dudley, and at the same time, it would seem, some favourable prospects respecting the succession. Mary made, however, an evasive reply, alleging that her friends would hardly agree that she should "embase herself so far as that." Dudley himself, who aspired to the hand of Elizabeth, felt no great inclination for the Scottish match: but the negotiations for it still went on, and, on the 5th of February, 1565, Randolph wrote that Mary was inclined to marry him. But now Elizabeth herself began to fluctuate. "I see,"

\* At this part is added, in Elizabeth's own handwriting, "Yea, perchance such as she could hardly think we could agree unto."



writes Cecil, "the queen's majesty very desirous to have my Lord of Leicester\* the Scottish queen's husband: but, when it cometh to the conditions which are demanded, I see her then remiss of her earnestness." In these words, written from one minister to another, where there could be no intention to deceive, we have the key to Elizabeth's conduct in this intricate business.

In the mean time, Mary had turned her thoughts to another English subject. Margaret Tudor, queen of Scots, had by her second husband, the Earl of Angus, a daughter, whom Henry VIII. gave in marriage, with an estate in England, to Matthew Stuart, earl of Lennox, when he was driven out of Scotland by the regent Arran. Lord Darnley, therefore, Lennox's eldest son, was on the father's side of the blood royal of Scotland, and on the mother's of that of England; and, being a Protestant, might prove a formidable rival to Mary for the English crown. Mary, with a view to this, had kept up a correspondence with the earl and countess of Lennox. In the autumn of 1564, probably by Mary's invitation, the earl went to Scotland to try to obtain a reversal of his attainder, and the restoration of his estates and honours: Elizabeth not merely giving her permission, but recommending him strongly to Mary, whom, at the same time, she warned to take care of offending the Hamiltons, the present possessors of Lennox's estates. Lennox was received with great distinction by his royal kinswoman; she effected an accommodation between him and Chatelherault, the head of the house of Hamilton; and, by inducing Lady Len-

\* In 1564, Elizabeth, with a view to his marriage with Mary, created Dudley Earl of Leicester and Baron Denbigh. She had said of him to Melvill a little before, that "she esteemed him as her brother and best friend, whom she would have herself married had she ever minded to have taken a husband; but, being determined to end her life in virginity, she wished the queen her sister might marry him, as meetest of all others with (for) whom she could find it in her heart to declare her second person."

nox to drop her claim on the earldom of Angus, she prevented any opposition from the potent house of Douglas. In the month of December, Lennox was restored by act of parliament to his titles and estates.

A marriage between Mary and Darnley had been for some time in treaty with Lennox; a rumour of it was now publicly spread; and it may be that the English ministers, and possibly Elizabeth herself, were not displeased at it. Mary was desirous of seeing Darnley; and Elizabeth, when applied to, made no difficulty in permitting him to go to Scotland. He reached Edinburgh on the 13th of February, 1565; and, on the 16th, waited on the queen at Wemys Castle, in Fife. "Her majesty," says Melvill, "took well with him; and said he was the lustiest [handsomest] and best-proportioned lang man that she had seen: for he was of high stature, lang and small, even and brent up [straight]: well instructed from his youth in all honest and comely exercises." He was, in effect, a tall, well-made youth of nineteen years, who danced, played the lute, and had the showy accomplishments of the age. He pleased the eye of Mary, and she took no time to ascertain the qualities of his mind, but at once fell violently in love with him. He offered her his hand and heart without delay; when she affected anger at his presumption, but, at the same time, secretly determined to espouse him.

There was a man named David Rizzio or Riccio, an Italian, who had come to Scotland in the suite of the ambassador of Savoy. He was retained in the queen's service on account of his skill in music; and she raised him to the post of her French secretary, and made him her favourite.\* As the graces of

\* Rizzio came to Scotland in 1564; and it is stated that the queen's three pages, or *songsters*, who sang trios for her amusement, wanted, at this time, a fourth voice for bass. Rizzio was selected; and this first introduced him to the notice of the queen. He is said to have been not only a proficient in music, but of polished manners, and well accomplished, though by no means prepossessing in his personal appearance.—*Am. Ed.*

the crown passed mostly through his hands, he was courted by the nobility; wealth came to him from various sources, and he displayed it with the usual vanity of an upstart, while his insolence augmented in proportion. The nobility, therefore, hated and despised him at the same time; and a suspicion also prevailed that he was a secret agent of the pope.

With this man Darnley condescended to ally himself, in order that he might employ his influence over the queen's mind in his favour. This disaffected the Protestant nobles with Darnley; while the open indifference which he manifested on the subject of religion alarmed them. Murray foresaw that unkindness to England would be the result, and in sorrow withdrew from court. The queen, however, was resolved to persevere; an agent was despatched to Rome for a dispensation, and Lethington was sent to inform Elizabeth, and ask her consent. But the knowledge which the council now had of the state of feeling in both kingdoms, made them view the match as fraught with peril; and, on the 23d of April, letters of recall were sent to Lennox and his son, which, however, they treated with neglect, and almost with contempt. On the 1st of May the council met, and determined that the intended marriage would be dangerous to the Protestant religion and to the queen's title; and that it was expedient to provide for a war with Scotland, if need should be. Throgmorton was sent to Edinburgh to make known these resolutions; and, in case of failure, he was to urge the Protestants to oppose the marriage, unless Darnley would promise to adhere to the Reformed religion.

Murray, as we have seen, had already withdrawn from court in disgust: but the queen, who knew of what importance it was to gain his approbation of her marriage, ordered him to repair to her at Stirling. She there employed all her arts and eloquence to induce him to sign a paper recommending the marriage. He hesitated to do so, alleging that he feared Darnley would be an enemy to Christianity. "She gave him," says Melvill, "many sore words; he answered with

humility, but nothing could be obtained from him." A convention of nobles met a few days after, on the 14th of May, with whom the gifts and blandishments of Mary had more effect than with her brother; and many gave their assent to her marriage. As, however, some still hesitated, another convention was appointed to meet at Perth.

Darnley now mortally hated Murray, as the chief obstacle to his ambition; and strong religious and political motives made the latter resolve to prevent the marriage, if possible. Darnley is said even to have formed a plan to assassinate his opponent; while Murray is charged with a design, in conjunction with Chatelherault, Argyle, and other nobles with whom he was associated, to seize Darnley and his father, and deliver them up to the warden of the English marches.\* Each party, it is added, received information of the designs of the other; and Mary, taking advantage of the popularity which the good government of Murray had procured her, assembled a force, and, advancing to Stirling, where the confederate lords were, obliged them to disperse and retire to their homes.

Mary had conferred on Darnley the titles of Earl of Ross and Duke of Albany, dignities appropriated to the royal family; and the dispensation having now arrived, and the banns having been duly published, she gave him her hand on the 29th of July, in the chapel of Holyrood House. The ceremony was performed according to the rites of the Romish Church; Darnley, however, withdrew during the performance of mass. She had agreed to give him the title of king, but wished to defer it till the parliament should meet, or till he should have attained his twenty-first year: the vain, headstrong youth, however, would have it then; and she was obliged to consent to his being proclaimed the evening before† the marriage. On

\* An officer who had jurisdiction over the English territory bordering on Scotland, called the marches (borders).—*Am. Ed.*

† "She can as much prevail with him in anything that is against his will," writes Randolph to Leicester, "as your lordship may with me to persuade that I should hang myself."

the day succeeding it, he was again proclaimed; and, though all the lords were present, no one said Amen. His father alone cried, "God save his queen!"

Immediately after her marriage, Mary outlawed Murray, set at liberty Lord Gordon and made him Earl of Huntley, and recalled Sutherland and Bothwell, who were in exile: all sworn foes to Murray. When Thomworth came, sent by Elizabeth, to insist that she should do nothing against the Reformation in England, she gave an ambiguous reply. She did the same when warned not to make any change in Scotland; and when, as instructed, he urged her to drop her displeasure against Murray, she desired that there might be no meddling in the affairs of her kingdom. She was, in fact, inveterate against her brother, and lost no time in collecting a force, with which she drove him and the other lords to seek refuge in Argyle. They soon after appeared in arms in the western counties, and the queen in person led her forces against them, riding at the head of her troops, with loaded pistols at her saddlebow.\* The lords made a rapid march to Edinburgh: but, as the people there did not join them as they had expected, and the queen was in close pursuit, they retired to Dumfries. Still followed by their implacable sovereign, and finding resistance hopeless, they crossed the borders and sought refuge in England. Murray and Hamilton, abbot of Kilwinning, repaired to London. In the presence of the French and Spanish ambassadors, Elizabeth, it is said, made them declare that she had not excited them to take arms against their sovereign; and when they had done so, she called them traitors, and ordered them to quit her presence.†

\* Mary undoubtedly discovered no ordinary intrepidity and talents on this occasion. Her measures, says Robertson, "were concerted with wisdom, executed with vigour, and attended with success;" and Knox himself, in allusion to the martial spirit displayed by her, confesses that "her courage was manlike, and always increasing." The conduct of Murray and the insurgent lords is less favourably considered by other historians than is here represented.—*Am. Ed.*

† Such is the account given by Melvill and the other Scottish

They retired to the northern marches, where Elizabeth secretly supplied them with money, and interceded for their pardon with their sovereign. Chatelherault was forgiven, on condition of his retiring to France; but Mary declared to Randolph that she would rather lose half her kingdom than show mercy to Murray. The king and her chief counsellors, Huntley, Athol, and Bothwell, were all hostile to him, and so also was Rizzio: though he had, says Melvill, "sued him earnestly and more humbly than could be believed, with the present of a fair diamond," for his interest in his behalf. But what most weighed with the queen was a message from her uncles, desiring her not to pardon the banished lords. This was brought by Clernau, the bearer of the treaty lately concluded at Bayonne for the extirpation of Protestantism, to which she readily affixed her signature.\* A parliament was summoned for the 12th of March, 1566, in order to attain the rebel lords, and to take steps towards the re-establishment of popery.

writers. Lord Burleigh (Raumer, Elizabeth and Mary, p. 70) says Elizabeth asked Murray "if he had ever undertaken anything against the person of his queen. This he most solemnly denied, and implored her to conserve the amity between her majesty and his sovereign." In conclusion, "she spoke very roundly to him before the ambassadors, that, whatsoever the world said or reported of her, she would by her actions let it appear that she would not, for the price of a world, maintain any subject in any disobedience against a prince."

\* This was a league entered into between the courts of France and Spain, for the extermination of the Protestants in their dominions, and the suppression of the Reformation throughout Europe.—*Am. Ed.*

## CHAPTER X.

## ELIZABETH (CONTINUED)

1566-1571.

**Murder of Rizzio.**—Mary's affection for Bothwell.—Murder of the King.—Proceedings in consequence of it.—Mary marries Bothwell.—Association of the Nobles.—Surrender of the Queen; her Imprisonment and Abdication; her Escape and Flight into England.—Conference at York and Hampton Court.—Proposed Marriage with the Duke of Norfolk.—Rising in the North.—Death and Character of the Regent Murray.—State of Politics.—Elizabeth excommunicated.

THE execution of these projects, however, was prevented by the perpetration of a deed which proved pregnant with calamity to the royal house of Scotland. Mary had now ceased to love her husband: the first fervour of her affection being over, she saw that he was devoid of every estimable quality, brutal in temper, and addicted to the grossest intemperance. She therefore gave no heed to his urgent demand of the crown-matrimonial, treated him with neglect and even aversion; and all her favour was monopolized by Rizzio, with whom the jealous Darnley now suspected her of improper familiarity. "It is a sore case," said he one day to his uncle Douglas, "that I can get no help against that villain David." "It is your own fault," was the reply; "you cannot keep a secret." Soon after a league, confirmed by the king's oath and signature, was formed between him and the lords Ruthven, Morton, Lindsay, and Maitland of Lethington: they were to put Rizzio to death, and procure Darnley the crown-matrimonial; and he was to bear them "scathless," to obtain an amnesty for the banished lords, and to secure the Protestant religion.

This compact was made on the 1st of March, and on the night of the 9th (Saturday), Ruthven, having risen from his bed of sickness for the purpose, and

cased himself in his armour, the associates were brought by Darnley up a private staircase, which led to the apartment where Mary was sitting at supper with Rizzio and Lady Argyle. The king went in and stood by her chair, with his arm round her waist. Ruthven entered pale and haggard, supported by two men. He desired that Rizzio should quit the room, but the queen said it was her will he should be there. Rizzio ran behind her for safety : a tumult ensued ; the table was overturned, and Rizzio was dragged out and despatched in the antechamber with fifty-six wounds. The queen, in the mean time, was interceding for him ; and a very indelicate conversation took place between her and her husband, in the presence of Ruthven, respecting his resumption of his conjugal rights. She then sent to learn the fate of Rizzio ; and when she found that he was dead, she said, " No more tears ; I must think of revenge ;" nor was she ever heard to lament him more.\* Bothwell and Huntley, when they were apprized what had occurred, made their escape from the palace by a window.

On Monday the 11th, Murray and his friends came to Edinburgh. Mary embraced and kissed her brother when she saw him, saying that " if he had been at home, he would not have allowed her to be so discourteously handled." He was affected even to tears. Mary now tried her arts on her weak, unstable husband, and she actually succeeded in prevailing on him to abandon his confederates, and make his escape with her the following night out of the palace. They fled to Dunbar. The king issued a proclamation, denying all knowledge of the conspiracy. Bothwell, Huntley, and other nobles repaired with their followers to Dunbar, and on the 19th the queen re-entered Edinburgh at the head of eight thousand men. The murderers of Rizzio were obliged to fly into England. The contempt and hatred which Mary felt for her

\* It would seem proper to remark, that the Scottish historians, with the single exception of Buchanan, give no serious countenance to the charge of criminal impropriety on the part of Mary towards Rizzio.—*Am. Ed.*



worthless husband she could not conceal; and her whole confidence was now given to Bothwell, between whom and Murray she effected a reconciliation.

On the 19th of June the queen gave birth to a son. Sir James Melvill was immediately despatched with the tidings to Elizabeth. When he arrived, the queen, who had just recovered from a severe illness, was at her favourite palace of Greenwich. She was dancing after supper: Cecil whispered the news to her, and she instantly stopped and sat down, resting her cheek on her hand. At length she gave vent to her feelings in these words: "The Queen of Scots is mother of a fair son, while I am but a barren stock." What could be more natural, what more blameless than such language? Yet those who will see nothing but duplicity in her conduct, ascribe to dissimulation the cheerful countenance with which she received Melvill the next morning, and the readiness with which she assented to his request that she would be godmother to the infant prince.

The alienation between Mary and her husband increased from day to day. He found himself generally shunned: for to show him any attention was a sure mode of losing the queen's favour. In his vexation, he formed the absurd project of quitting the kingdom and going to the Continent, but the silly plan came to no effect. Meanwhile, the queen's visible partiality for Bothwell gave occasion to rumours injurious to her character; and an incident, which occurred in the following October, added strength to suspicion. She went to Jedburgh to hold a justiciary court for suppressing the disorders of the borders. Bothwell, whom she had made warden of the marches, preceded her by some days; and, having been wounded in the hand in a scuffle with one of the borderers named Elliott, was conveyed to his castle of Hermitage. The queen, having passed some days in great anxiety on his account, took the sudden resolution of going herself to see him. Though the weather was bad and the roads in a wretched state, she rode with a few attendants to Hermitage, a distance of twenty miles; and having as-

sured herself that his life was in no danger, returned the same day to Jedburgh. Her bodily exertion, combined with mental uneasiness, threw her the next day into a fever, and for some days her life was despaired of. The vigour of her constitution, however, triumphed over her disorder.

After her recovery the queen took up her abode at the castle of Craigmillar, near Edinburgh; here the measure of a divorce was discussed by Maitland and others: and she made no objection to it on any ground but her unwillingness to prejudice her son. On the 17th of December, the ceremony of the young prince's baptism was performed at Stirling; and though the king was in the castle, either owing to his own caprice or to the coldness of the queen, he was not present at it. On the other hand, Bothwell was appointed to receive the French and English ambassadors, and to regulate the ceremonial of the christening. Through his influence, Morton and the other murderers of Rizzio were pardoned on the 24th, on which day the king left the court and retired to his father's house at Glasgow, where in a few days he was attacked by the smallpox. The queen, when she heard of his illness, sent her own physician to attend him.

On the 20th of January, 1567, Bothwell and Lethington went to Morton's residence at Wittingham, and Bothwell proposed the murder of the king to him, saying, "it was the queen's mind that he should be taken away." Morton objected, being, as he said, but just come out of trouble on a similar account: but he finally agreed, provided he should have the queen's handwriting for his warrant. This, however, they were unable to procure.

From the time of Rizzio's murder up to the present date, the queen had shown no affection to her husband; and on the 20th she wrote to her ambassador at Paris complaining of him and his father. The next day she set out for Glasgow. While there she feigned the utmost fondness for the king, yet her letters at the same time to Bothwell display the most ardent love for that nobleman. Her object was to get her

husband into her power : in this she succeeded, and brought him back with her to Edinburgh on the 31st of January. Pretending that the situation and noise of Holyrood House would be injurious to him in his delicate state, she placed him in a lone house without the city, named the Kirk of Field, and had a chamber fitted up for herself under him, in which she sometimes slept. On Sunday night, the 9th of February, she stayed with him till ten o'clock ; and then recollecting that she had promised to give a mask at the palace on the occasion of the marriage of one of her servants, she took leave of him. At two in the morning a loud explosion was heard, and daylight revealed the Kirk of Field in ruins. The dead body of the king was found at a little distance in the fields, without any marks of violence ; and the house, it appeared, had been blown up with gunpowder.

On the 12th a proclamation was issued, offering a reward of £1000 for the discovery of the murderers. A paper was found fixed on the gates of the Tolbooth on the 16th, naming Bothwell and his accomplices, and accusing the queen of being privy to it ; and voices speaking to the same effect were heard in the silence of the night. The council called on the accuser to appear : a second placard announced that he would, and that with four witnesses, if Bothwell and two of the queen's servants, who were named, were taken into custody. The council made no reply. Lennox wrote to Mary, urging that the persons accused should be brought to trial. She evaded compliance ; and, though every tongue named Bothwell as the murderer, she continued to give him daily proofs of her favour. She bestowed on him, on the 15th, the superiority of the port of Leith ; and, on the 19th of March, made him governor of the castle of Edinburgh. Still the popular voice was so strong, and a letter from Archbishop Beaton, her envoy at Paris, showed her so plainly the ill report there was of her on the Continent, that she saw no way of eluding the demand for a trial. It was therefore fixed for the 12th of April ; thus giving Lennox but fourteen instead of forty days.

the usual time, to prepare for the prosecution. The accused, in the mean time, were at liberty; and Bothwell himself actually sat as a member of the privy council which arranged the manner of the trial!

It was evident that anything but impartial justice was intended. Lennox, feeling his weakness, had applied to Elizabeth for aid; and that princess, in a letter which does her honour, entreated of Mary not to precipitate the proceedings in this manner: "For the love of God, madam," says she, "use such sincerity and prudence in this matter, which concerns you so nearly, that the whole world may have reason to declare you innocent of so enormous a crime; which, if you committed, you would be justly cast out of the ranks of princesses, and not without reason made the reproach of the vulgar; and sooner than that should befall you, I would wish you an honourable grave rather than a spotted life. You see, madam, that I treat you as my daughter," etc. All was in vain: Lennox did not venture to appear. No witness or evidence was produced: for Bothwell came to his trial so well attended by armed men, that it had been dangerous to do so; and he was, of course, acquitted. Mary then affected to regard him as fully cleared; and, when she went to open the parliament, he bore the sword of state before her. Lennox fled into England. Still numerous placards showed that the public were by no means satisfied of Bothwell's innocence.

The strongest possible proof of Bothwell's influence over the queen's mind was given at this time. Mary, a bigoted Catholic, who never for a moment had swerved from her purpose of destroying the Protestant religion, and who had lately subscribed the treaty of Bayonne, assented to an act of parliament repealing all laws adverse to the Reformers, and giving their religion the safeguard of law. Bothwell's object evidently was to gain the support of the Protestants, whose creed he had always professed. He now went a step farther: on the day of the dissolution of parliament he invited all the nobles to sup at a tavern. He had the house filled and surrounded with his armed

dependants ; after supper he opened to them his design of marrying the queen ; he said he had her own consent ; and he wished them to subscribe a bond recommending the marriage, and pledging themselves to maintain it. Some were already in the secret, some were gained by promises, others yielded to fear, and all subscribed the bond.

Three days after, on the 22d of April, Mary went to Stirling to visit her son ; and, as she was on her return, she was met near Linlithgow by Bothwell at the head of a large body of armed men. He dispersed her train, took the bridle of her horse, and led her and some of her attendants, among whom were Huntley, Lethington, and Melvill, to Dunbar. The person who conducted Melvill told him it was done with the queen's consent, and her own letters prove that it had been all arranged between her and Bothwell. It may increase our disgust at this proceeding, to know that Bothwell was at this time the husband of Huntley's sister : but means had been devised to dissolve the union. The queen had restored the Archbishop of St. Andrew's to his jurisdiction ; and, to quiet her Catholic scruples, Bothwell had commenced a suit for a divorce, on the ground of consanguinity, in his court, while Lady Jane Gordon was prosecuting a collusive one against him for adultery in the Protestant court ; and sentence was easily procured in both courts. A report was also put forth that Bothwell had offered personal violence to the queen at Dunbar ; and when Craig, a minister at Edinburgh, was commanded to publish the banns (for she now was going to marry Bothwell), he refused on that ground ; and, when obliged to do so, he declared from the pulpit that " he abhorred and detested the marriage, as hateful in the sight of the world."

Mary was conducted to Edinburgh by Bothwell on the 3d of May. She there appeared before the court of session, and declared that, though Bothwell's insolence in seizing her had at first excited her indignation, his subsequent conduct had been so respectful that she forgave him, and was resolved to raise him

to the highest honours. She then created him Earl of Orkney; on the 15th she was married to him publicly, according to the rites of the Protestant Church, by the Bishop of Orkney, and afterward in private, according to those of that of Rome.

We need not inform our readers that the question of Mary's participation in Bothwell's crime (for of his guilt no one has ever doubted) is one which has been disputed from her own time down to the present. After duly weighing the evidence, our own most decided conviction is, that she was guilty of the murder of her husband, and that she went to Glasgow for the sole purpose of luring him to his destruction.\*

But her guilt was not to go unpunished: the Reformation had exalted the moral sense of the people and the dead silence which prevailed when she appeared in public showed what were their thoughts. Bothwell, too, was not kind: he surrounded her with his creatures, and exercised the whole royal authority. His great object was to get the young prince into his power (doubtless for the worst of purposes): but the firmness of the Earl of Mar, who had charge of the

\* "The suffering innocence of Mary," says Laing, "is a theme appropriated to tragedy and romance, and her vindication consists entirely of popular arguments and the misrepresentation of facts; of declamation, fiction, invective, ribaldry, and the grossest abuse. But the sober voice of impartial history, from Thuanus to Hume and Robertson, has deduced her guilt from the moral evidence which her conduct affords, and from a calm and accurate investigation of facts." Any one who reads this writer's dissertation on the murder of Darnley, and rises with a doubt on his mind of Mary's guilt, may rest assured that, whatever may be his talents, history is not his vocation.†

† In the affair of Darnley's murder, as in almost every other transaction implicating her character, the Queen of Scots has her apologists as well as accusers. The greater number of historians undoubtedly incline to the opinion that she was privy to his death; and from all the circumstances, her aversion to her husband, and her evident partiality to Bothwell, &c., most readers, also, probably come to a similar conclusion. At the same time, there are those who wholly deny the charge, and entirely exculpate Mary from any previous knowledge of, or participation in, this dreadful transaction.—For a statement of the arguments advanced by such writers as take the side of the queen, see Bell's *Life of Mary*, ii., 20, *et seq.*, 21, 22, *Harpers' Family Library*.—*Am. Ed.*

royal infant, and whom Melvill conjured to save him "from the hands of those who had slain his father," prevented him from accomplishing his boast, "that he would warrant him from avenging the death of his father."

The insolence of Bothwell, the danger of the prince, and the reproaches of foreign nations, at length roused the Scottish nobles. Argyle, Athol, Morton, Lindsay, Glencairn, Mar, Lethington, and others, met at Stirling, and entered into an association for the defence of the prince. The queen, on her side, put forth a proclamation on the 28th of May, calling on her subjects to arm, and meet her husband on an appointed day. They came, however, but slowly and ill affected; and Mary, fearing for her safety, was conducted by Bothwell to Borthwick Castle, from which, however, he was soon forced to fly to Dunbar, on the appearance of Lord Home with a body of troops. Mary accompanied his flight in male attire. Having collected what troops she could, she advanced to Carberry Hill, near Edinburgh, on the 15th of June; and the lords led their forces out against her. Le Croc, the French ambassador, vainly sought to mediate. She offered pardon. "We will be satisfied," said Morton, "with the punishment of the murderer of the late king." "As to pardon," said Glencairn, "we have not come here to ask pardon for any offence we have done, but rather to grant pardon to those who have offended." Finding such to be their temper, and failing in her efforts to rouse her own troops to action, Mary took a farewell (a final one)\* of Bothwell, and surrendered to a chief named Kirkcaldy, of Grange, who had assured her of the obedience of the lords provided she dismissed Bothwell, and would engage to govern by their advice. The lords received her with great respect, and conducted her to Edinburgh. The unhappy woman was assailed as she went along with maledictions and the foulest epithets; for the populace had not a doubt of her guilt. When she

\* They had been exactly a month married. So little did they gain by their crime!

rose in the morning, the first object that met her view was the white flag, which had waved the day before at Carberry Hill, displayed before her window, and on which was portrayed the body of her husband beneath a tree, as it had been found, and her infant son on his knees, saying, "Judge, and avenge my cause, oh Lord!"\*

Mary had pledged herself to give up Bothwell; yet that very night a letter from her to him was brought by the bearer to the lords, in which she called him her "dear heart, whom she would never forget nor abandon for absence." They saw she was not to be trusted; and the next day, June 16, they sent her a prisoner to the castle of Lochleven,† situated on a small island in a lake: its owner, William Douglas, was related to Morton, and married to Murray's mother. The lords soon had convincing proof of the queen's guilt. Bothwell sent one of his servants to fetch him a casket which he had left in the castle of Edinburgh: the messenger was seized, and the casket was found to contain letters and sonnets in the queen's handwriting, which proved her guilt beyond contradiction. Nothing could prevail on the infatuated woman to give up the partner of her crime. "She avoweth constantly," writes Throgmorton, "that she will live and die with him; and saith that, if it were put to her choice to relinquish her crown and kingdom or the Lord Bothwell, she would leave her kingdom and dignity to go as a simple damsel with him; and that she will never consent that he shall fare worse or have more harm than herself."

\* "The women be most furious and impudent against the queen, and yet the men be mad enough," writes Throgmorton to Elizabeth, July 14.

† "She spoke," says Le Croc (Raum., ii., 103), "on her arrival at Edinburgh of nothing but hanging and crucifying them all, and proceeds constantly in the same fashion, which drives every one to extremity. For they feared lest in the moment of her liberation she would hasten to Bothwell and begin everything anew; for this reason she was brought in the night to Lochleven." At this time, he adds, Lethington swore to him "by his God that they as yet were in alliance neither with Elizabeth nor any foreign power."



To restore Mary to power was therefore out of the question. Some would have been content if she had resigned her crown to her son, and retired to France or England; others required her trial and condemnation, but would have been satisfied with her perpetual imprisonment; a third party, more stern, demanded her capital punishment as the penalty due to her crimes, and as the only mode of assuring the safety of the realm. It was finally concluded to be content for the present with her resignation. Lord Lindsay, a man of rough, brutal manners, was sent to her on the 25th of July, and, under the threat of instant death if she refused, he made her sign her own abdication, and consent to the coronation of her son, an appointment of Murray to the regency, and that of certain others if he should refuse. She subscribed with tears: but Lethington and some of her other friends had secretly directed Sir Robert Melvill to assure her that her resignation was void, and might be revoked when she was at liberty.

Four days after, July 29, the prince was crowned at Stirling by the title of James VI. On the 11th of August Murray returned from France, whither he had retired some months before. He visited his unhappy sister, and she burst into tears at the sight of him. He spoke the truth freely and plainly. "Sometimes," says Melvill, "she wept bitterly, sometimes she acknowledged her misgovernment; some things she did confess plainly, some things she did excuse, some things she did extenuate." He could only then leave her to God's mercy: but next morning he assured her of life, and of the preservation of her honour, as far as in him lay. Liberty, he said, it was not in his power to give her: nor would it be good for her to have it at present. She then took him in her arms and kissed him. On the 22d he was proclaimed regent.

It may be asked, How did the Queen of England act all this time? The reply is, greatly to her honour. Elizabeth had high notions of the majesty of sovereigns, and she was little pleased with the example of

subjects rising up against them. She, moreover, regarded Mary as a kinswoman, and as the presumptive heiress of the crown. On the intelligence, therefore, of her captivity, she despatched Throgmorton to Scotland, to exert himself in her behalf; she menaced, and she even proposed to the French government to put a stop to all traffic with the rebels, as she styled them, and their abettors. "No counsel," writes Cecil, "can stop her majesty from manifesting her misliking of the proceedings against the Queen of Scots." She ran the risk of seeing the lords throw themselves into the arms of France; and when the Hamiltons, Huntley, and others confederated against the regent and in favour of the queen, she gave them encouragement through Throgmorton.

We must now relate the fate of Bothwell. He fled to his dukedom of Orkney, where he hired some ships, with the intention of passing over to Denmark: but Kirkcaldy of Grange and Murray of Tullibardine, who were sent in pursuit of him, captured all his vessels but one, in which he escaped to Norway. There (as he had no papers to produce, and his ship had once been commanded by a noted pirate) he was detained a prisoner; and when his portfolio, containing the proclamations of the council for his apprehension, etc., was found, he was sent to Copenhagen. He was imprisoned in the castle of Malmö, in Scania, where he died, bereft of reason, in 1576.

On the 15th of December, 1567, the Scottish parliament met, and all the late proceedings were pronounced lawful and were confirmed. The contents of the casket were produced and read, and Mary was declared to have been accessory to the murder of her husband. The acts of 1560, in favour of the Protestant religion, were ratified, and it was now finally established.

But, though Huntley and several of Mary's partisans attended this parliament and supported the measures introduced, their jealousy of the regent soon arrayed them again in arms. They opened a communication with Mary, who appointed the Duke of Chatelherault

to be her lieutenant. Murray, in the mean time, visited her again; and she proposed, in order to quiet all fears respecting Bothwell, to marry his half-brother, George Douglas, son to the Lady of Lochleven, a youth eighteen years of age. Murray objected to his humble birth, so far beneath her rank. It was all, however, merely a scheme of Mary's to conceal her real design. She had flattered Douglas to induce him to aid her escape. On the 25th of March, 1568, having changed clothes with the laundress who used to come from a village near the lake, she got into the boat, and had nearly reached the shore, when one of the boatmen went to raise her "muffler," saying, "let us see what sort of a dame this is!" She put up her hand to prevent him; its whiteness raised their suspicions; they refused to land her, and carried her back to the island, but did not betray her. On the 2d of May she was more fortunate. While Lady Douglas and her eldest son were at supper, a youth called the little Douglas stole the keys of the castle. Mary hastened to a boat that lay ready; Douglas locked the castle gate on the outside, and flung the keys into the lake as they rowed across it. On the shore Mary was met by George Douglas, Lord Seaton, and others. She mounted a horse, and rode to Lord Seaton's house of Niddry; and, having rested there for three hours, she mounted again and rode to Hamilton, where she was received by the nobles of her party, at the head of three thousand of their followers. Her first act was to protest against the instruments she had been compelled to sign when in prison, and which were pronounced illegal by the nobles present, many of whom had declared the direct contrary in the late parliament.

Murray was, in the mean time, at Glasgow, with only his ordinary train; and some of his friends advised him to fly to Stirling: but he was too prudent to take such a course. He amused the queen for a few days by negotiation, during which time he assembled a force of about four thousand men, with which he resolved to give her battle. Though the royal

troops were double the number, their leaders wished to wait the return of Huntley and Ogilvie, who were gone to the north to assemble their vassals. Meanwhile they proposed to place the queen for security in the castle of Dumbarton: but, on their way thither, on the 13th of May, the regent brought them to action, at a place named Langside Hill, and routed them in the space of a quarter of an hour. Mary, who from an adjacent eminence viewed the fight, saw at once that all was lost. She turned, urged her horse to speed, and, having failed in an attempt to reach Dumbarton, rode without halting to Dundrennan Abbey, near Kirkcudbright, on the Solway Frith, a distance of sixty Scottish miles. Lord Herries and a few others, among whom was the French ambassador, accompanied her flight.

What was this wretched princess now to do? To make her escape to the Highlands was difficult, if not impossible, and the toils and privations she might have to undergo when she reached them were not easy to appreciate. To escape to France was equally difficult; pride forbade her to appear as a fugitive where she had reigned a queen; the prospect of being shut up in a nunnery (the course which the French government had proposed for her) was probably not an agreeable one; and an ignominious death in all probability awaited her if she fell into the hands of her enraged subjects. There remained but one course, a flight into England. Elizabeth had of late exerted herself warmly in her favour, and might be disposed to assert her cause. She therefore directed Herries to write, on the 15th of May, to Mr. Lowther, the governor of Carlisle, to know if she might come thither in safety. She did not, however, venture to wait for a reply: fearing to fall into the power of her enemies, she embarked next day, with Lord Herries and about twenty attendants, in a fishing-boat, and landed at Workington. The gentry of the vicinity conducted her, with all due respect, to Cockermouth, whence Lowther brought her to Carlisle. She had little or no

VOL. III.—E

money, and not even a change of clothes when she landed in England.

Mary lost no time in writing to Elizabeth: assuming, as she did on all occasions, that she was an innocent and injured person, she required to be admitted to the queen's presence, and to be restored to her authority by force. The English council took the case into most grave and solemn consideration: they weighed the arguments on all sides; they viewed the dangers likely to arise to England, and to Protestantism in general; they saw equal peril in suffering Mary to go to France or Spain, or to return to Scotland; and they decided that she should be detained for the present in England. They may certainly have been swayed by secret prejudice, or they may have fancied danger that was but imaginary: but, beyond question, they did what they believed to be right; and they must have known what the dangers to be apprehended really were far better than we can do. Leaving, then, declamation to the advocates of Mary, we hesitate not to say that, under the circumstances, the council acted wisely and well in our opinion.

To Mary's request for a personal interview it was replied, that till the murder of Darnley and the subsequent events were explained, Elizabeth could not, with honour, admit her into her presence: but that, if Mary cleared herself on a judicial inquiry, the queen would chastise her rebellious subjects and restore her by force of arms. Mary and her fast friend, Lord Herries, long struggled against the proposed inquiry: at length she consented that Elizabeth "should send for the noblemen of Scotland, that they might answer, before such noblemen of England as should be chosen by her, why they had deposed their queen." Mary was now (July 28) at Lord Scroop's castle of Bolton, in Yorkshire, whither she had been removed from Carlisle.

It may be here noticed, as an instance of the duplicity of which Mary was capable, that she who, when in power, would not even listen to the Scottish Reformed clergy, now affected great veneration for the English liturgy, was often present at the Protestant

worship, chose a Protestant clergyman for her chaplain, listened with attention and apparent pleasure while he exposed the errors of Romanism, and seemed on the point of becoming a convert.\*

On the 4th of October, the conference, as it was termed, was opened at York. The Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Sussex, and Sir Ralph Sadler were the English commissioners; Mary was represented by Lesly, bishop of Ross, Lord Herries, and five other persons; on the part of the king and parliament of Scotland appeared the regent, the lords Morton and Lindsay, and others; and among their assistants were Lethington, and the celebrated George Buchanan. Mary's agents commenced by demanding justice for the various indignities and injuries offered to her, from the first revolt to her flight into England. Murray was now in a difficult situation: if he should produce the proofs which he had of the queen's guilt, he would cut off all hope of reconciliation; and if he did not, he in effect would allow that he was a rebel. He took refuge in forms and verbal distinctions: his defence, therefore, was feeble, and Mary's advocate had plainly the advantage. Finding that he must advance, he was anxious to ascertain if Elizabeth would secure him against the consequences, in case of his making the accusation and proving its truth. With this view he privately laid before the commissioners the letters, sonnets, and marriage contracts of Mary to Bothwell. Of the genuineness of these documents they declared themselves convinced, and they wrote to that effect to the queen. Elizabeth now deemed it advisable to have the conference more at hand; and it was accordingly removed to Hampton Court, with Mary's full approbation, who still reckoned that Murray would not venture to produce his strong evidence. Cecil and Bacon, with Lord Clinton, and the earls of Leices-

\* Robertson says, it is impossible to believe she was sincere; but he adds, "nor can anything mark more strongly the wretchedness of her condition and the excess of her fears, than that they betrayed her into dissimulation in a matter concerning which her sentiments were at all other times scrupulously delicate."

ter and Arundel, were added to the commission. Lennox now came forward, and openly charged the queen with the murder of his son. Murray was obliged to proceed in his charge and produce his proofs. When Herries and Lesly saw the blow, which they had long warded, at length struck, they refused to answer, unless their mistress "were allowed to justify herself in the presence of the Queen of England, the whole nobility of the kingdom, and the ambassadors of foreign states." But it was now too late to object to the present made of proceeding. They in effect confessed that the evidence now produced could not be refuted. "The objections," says Hume, "made to the authority of these papers are, in general, of small force: but, were they ever so specious, they cannot now be hearkened to, since Mary, at the time when the truth could have been fully cleared, did in effect ratify the evidence against her, by recoiling from the inquiry at the very critical moment, and refusing to give an answer to the accusation of her enemies."

We may now assume that Elizabeth and her ministers had not the slightest doubt of Mary's guilt. Still, though the queen dismissed Murray with kindness, and made him a loan of £5000 (\$24,000) for the expenses of his journey, she would not sanction the principle of the right of the people to depose their sovereigns, by treating with him as regent or acknowledging the young king of Scotland. As Bolton was in a part abounding with Catholics, Mary was now removed to Tutbury, in Staffordshire, a seat of the Earl of Shrewsbury; still liberty was offered to her if she would resign her crown or associate her son with her in the government, Murray to have the regency during the prince's minority. She refused, justly alleging that such an act would be a confession of her guilt. She demanded to be allowed to go to France; but Elizabeth was too apprehensive of the danger of that course; and, though she knew that Mary's presence in England might cause much mischief, she chose it as the lesser evil, in reliance on her own fortitude and address.

Yet, at this very time, some of the leading English nobility were engaged on the side of Mary. During the conference at York, the subtle Lethington hinted to the Duke of Norfolk a match between him, now a widower, and the Queen of Scots. Norfolk listened to the offer, but he stated that the letters which he had seen with Murray made him hesitate. A communication seems to have been opened with Mary, who showed no disinclination to the proposed alliance. At Hampton Court Murray himself made the same proposal to Norfolk. Those who will allow the regent no virtue say that he was insincere, and that his only motive was to secure his life, as Norton, one of Norfolk's partisans, intended to waylay and murder him on his return home through the north. But we may surely as well suppose that he was also actuated by an honest desire to see his sister married to an English nobleman of the highest rank and a Protestant, and the peace and happiness of the two kingdoms thus permanently secured.

After Murray's departure Norfolk associated himself with the earls of Leicester, Arundel, Pembroke, and others, both Catholics and Protestants; and Sir Nicholas Throgmorton also engaged warmly in the project. A letter was written by Leicester to the Queen of Scots, and signed by the rest, recommending Norfolk to her for a husband, but stipulating for a renunciation of all claims to the throne of England during the lives of Elizabeth and her heirs, for a perpetual league between the two kingdoms, and for the establishment of the Protestant religion in Scotland. Mary returned a favourable reply, and the confederates went on strengthening themselves. It is said, too, that the kings of France and Spain were secretly consulted and gave their approbation. The previous consent of Elizabeth, however, was all along supposed; but they seem to have reckoned on making their party so strong that she would not venture to refuse it.

It seems strange to see so many of her principal nobles (even Leicester included) thus, as it were, in a



conspiracy against Elizabeth; but jealousy of Cecil and Bacon, who were known to favour the claims of the house of Suffolk, was at the bottom of it with some; others, and even Norfolk himself, may have thought the measure really good for the country; and the Catholics looked to the re-establishment of their religion by means of it.

The affair, however, could not be expected to remain long a secret from the queen and Cecil. Elizabeth, on the 13th of August, 1569, took the duke to dinner at Farnham. "Be careful," said she to him, "of the pillow on which you are about to lay your head." He understood the allusion, and replied, "I will never marry a person with whom I could not be sure of my pillow." Soon after, Leicester (whom Norfolk is said to have urged in vain to reveal the whole to the queen) fell sick, or feigned sickness, at Titchfield, and when Elizabeth came to visit him he told her all he knew. The queen then taxed Norfolk with his designs, and charged him to abandon them. He readily promised, spoke disparagingly of the Scottish match, affirming that his English estates were nearly as valuable as the kingdom of Scotland, and that, when he was in his own tennis-court at Norwich, he thought himself a petty prince. Finding himself looked upon coolly, he shortly after left the court without permission, and retired to Norfolk. He soon, however, repented of this step and was returning, but was arrested and sent to the Tower on the 9th of October. Pembroke, Arundel, Lumley, and Throgmorton were also put in custody.

In the mean time, rumours of a meditated rising in the north prevailed. Sussex, the lord president, summoned the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland before him; their excuses, however, satisfied him, and he dismissed them. The reports growing stronger, the queen wrote on the 10th of November, summoning the two earls to court; but they had gone too far in treason to venture on that course. In conjunction with Radcliffe, Sussex's own brother, with Leonard, uncle of Lord Dacres, and the families of the

Nortons, Markenfields, Tempesta, and others, they had been in constant communication with Mary and with her friends in Scotland; they had also arranged with the Duke of Alva, Philip's vicegerent in the Netherlands, for the landing of a body of Spanish auxiliaries; and one of his ablest captains, Ciapping Vitelli, had been sent over to London on some trifling embassy, to be on the spot to take the command of them when they should land.

Northumberland being a timid, irresolute man, his more energetic followers employed the following expedient to rouse him. At midnight one of his servants rushed into his chamber, crying out that his enemies, Oswald, Ulstrop, and Vaughan, were surrounding the place with armed men. He rose in a hurry and fled to a lodge in his park; and the next night he went to Brancespeath, a seat of the Earl of Westmoreland's, where a large number of those who were in the secret were assembled. A manifesto was immediately put forth in the usual style, expressive of the utmost loyalty to the queen, but declaring their intentions to rescue her out of the hands of evil counsellors, to obtain the release of the duke and other peers, and to re-establish the religion of their fathers. They marched to Durham on the 16th of November, where they "purified" the churches by burning the Protestant Bibles and Prayer-books. At Ripon they restored the mass; and on Clifford Moor they mustered seven thousand men. Richard Norton, a venerable old gentleman, who had joined them with his five sons, raised in their front a banner displaying the Saviour with the blood streaming from his five wounds.\* Finding that the Catholics in general were loyal to the queen, and that Sussex was collecting an efficient force at York, on the 16th of December they fell back to Hexham. Here the footmen dispersed; and the earls, with the horse, about five hundred in number, fled to Naworth and thence into Scotland.

\* The fate of the Nortons is commemorated (though not with strict historic accuracy) in Wordsworth's most beautiful poem of *The White Doe of Rylstone*."

Northumberland was taken and delivered to the regent, who confined him in Lochleven Castle; and, some years after, he was given up to the English government, and was executed at York. Westmoreland made his escape to Flanders, where he died in 1584, commandant of a Spanish regiment. Many executions, as was to be expected, took place. The Queen of Scots, for greater security, had been removed from Tutbury to Coventry.

Soon after, Leonard Dacres collected about three thousand men at his castle of Naworth, and the queen's cousin, Carey lord Huntsdon,\* advanced from Durham with an equal number against him. They engaged on the banks of a stream named the Chelt, on the 22d of February, 1570, and about three hundred fell on either side. The rebels, however, were defeated, and Dacres escaped to Scotland, and thence to Flanders, where he died in poverty.

Elizabeth and Cecil were now fully convinced of the danger of having Mary in England: for, as that wise minister plainly foresaw, the horror inspired by her guilt would gradually soften down and give place to pity. Negotiations were therefore set on foot with her and with the regent for her return to Scotland: indeed, it has been said that there was a private treaty with Murray for giving her up to him. But the regent's sudden death put an end to all these projects: he was assassinated on the 23d of July, 1570, as he was riding through Linlithgow, by one Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh, from motives of private revenge.

As with other distinguished individuals at this time, the character of Murray appears in very opposite lights in the narratives of the two conflicting religious parties. His great abilities, however, are acknowledged by all; by the people he was long remembered as "the good regent;" and his moral virtues were extolled by his Catholic countrymen abroad. His zeal for the Protestant religion seems to have been sincere; and he was, perhaps, as free from errors

\* He was the son of Mary, the elder sister of Anne Boleyn.

as it was easy for a public man to be in those times. But the advocates of his sister have, from his own time down to the present day, sought to make him the scapegoat for her sins : assuming, as Mackintosh says, "that she did nothing which she appears to have done, and that he did all that he appears to have cautiously abstained from doing."

The Scots and Kers, border chiefs and partisans of Mary, having made an inroad into England, Sussex invaded Scotland. The regency was soon after committed to the Earl of Lennox, the young king's grandfather.

We can hardly conceive it possible for any one, who reads with attention the various collections of state papers relating to this period of English history, to escape the conviction, that there was an extensive conspiracy of the pope, the King of Spain, and the Duke of Alva, his vicegerent in the Netherlands, in which the court of France also partly shared, the object of which was the dethronement, and probably the death, of Elizabeth, the elevation of Mary in her place, and the overthrow of the Protestant religion. It seems to be also certain that Mary knew and fully approved of this conspiracy, and secretly corresponded with the heads of it ; that her Catholic partisans, both in England and Scotland, were ready to take arms in support of it ; that Norfolk was apprized of and sanctioned the measure, at least so far as related to the liberation of the Queen of Scots, and his own marriage with her ; and that Arundel, Pembroke, and other nobles probably favoured it. It is not a little remarkable, that, not two months after Mary's flight into England, the English ministry obtained secret information to this effect : for Sir Henry Norris\* wrote to Cecil from Paris on the 7th of July, 1568, that the night before he had had a private meeting with the French provost-marshal, at the desire of

\* He was son to Norris who suffered death on account of Anne Boleyn. One of Elizabeth's first cares had been to promote this family.

the latter, who said to him, "he wished that he should advertise that the queen's majesty *did hold the wolf that would devour her*; and that it is conspired betwixt the King of Spain, the pope, and the French king, that the queen should be destroyed, whereby the Queen of Scots might succeed her majesty;" with more of the same character, mentioning particularly the name of Arundel. There is every reason to believe that it was Catharine de' Medici herself who caused the information to be thus conveyed to Elizabeth, out of jealousy to Mary, or through fear of seeing Britain under one head, and closely united, perhaps, with Spain.\*

We have noticed these particulars (and we could increase them to a great extent) to show that Mary was not the meek, suffering saint that her admirers would make her to be.† They likewise serve to prove that Elizabeth was not actuated by pure malignity and petty female revenge in her treatment of her royal prisoner; and that she only *did hold the wolf that would devour her* in obedience to the great principle of self-preservation. The zealous and intolerant Pius V., just at this time, as if to prove to the world that Elizabeth was justified in acting as she had, published, on the 25th of February, his celebrated bull, *Regnans in excelsis*, in which, in the tone of a Gregory or

\* "The cardinal (of Lorraine) showed the queen-mother how hurtful to the crown of France would the union of the isle of Britain be; and thought meet that she should advertise the Queen of England to take order thereto, *which the queen-mother failed not to do*. This the queen (Mary) *told me herself*, complaining of the cardinal's unkindly dealing."—Melvill, p. 239.

† The love of power and a passion for revenge were leading traits in Mary's character. "She told me," writes Knowles in 1568. "she would rather that all her party were hanged than submit to Murray; and, if she were not retained, she would go into Turkey rather than not be revenged on him." Her dissimulation, too, was extreme; while she was writing to Elizabeth in this strain, "I wish you knew what sincerity of love and affection are in my heart for you," she prays the pope "to forgive her for writing loving and soothing letters to Elizabeth; she desires nothing more than the re-establishment of the Catholic religion in England."

an Innocent, he pronounced "the *pretended* Queen of England" excommunicate, and deprived of all title to her pretended kingdom; absolving all her subjects from their allegiance, and forbidding them, under pain of excommunication, to obey her. Copies of this bull were forwarded to the Duke of Alva for distribution in the seaports of the Netherlands, and through him some of them were transmitted to the Spanish ambassador at London. On the morning of the 15th of May, one of them was found affixed to the Bishop of London's gate. Strict search was accordingly made, and a copy of the bull was discovered in the chambers of a student of Lincoln's Inn, who confessed that he had got it from a gentleman of good property, named John Felton, who lived in Southwark. Felton, when arrested, owned that he had posted it on the bishop's gate, and gloried in the deed: he was tried, found guilty, and executed as a traitor, and by himself and the more zealous Romanists he was viewed as a martyr. The bull, however, produced no immediate effect. "The time," says Lingard, "was gone by when the thunders of the Vatican could shake the thrones of princes:" a change for which, he might have added, the world is indebted to the Reformers. Elizabeth is said to have applied to the emperor to use his influence to have it revoked, as she knew not what its effects might be on enthusiasts and bigots.

On the very day that Felton was arraigned, the Duke of Norfolk was released from the Tower, and suffered to reside in his own house, under the mild custody of Sir Henry Neville. He expressed his sorrow for what he had done, and bound himself not to proceed in the affair of his marriage without the queen's knowledge. Yet, even while in the Tower, he had contrived to carry on a correspondence with Mary; and, now that he was at large, he still kept it up.

Elizabeth, urged by the foreign ambassadors, and anxious herself to get rid of her dangerous captive, if it could be done with safety, sent Cecil and Sir

William Mildway in October to Chatsworth, where Mary now was, to try if any accommodation could be effected. It was proposed that she should resign all claim to the throne of England during the lives of Elizabeth and her issue; marry no Englishman without Elizabeth's consent, and no one else without that of the states of Scotland; send her son to be educated in England, &c. The Earl of Morton and some others came to England as commissioners on the part of the young king. But nothing could be definitively arranged, and the two queens and their friends made mutual charges of insincerity.

In the beginning of the year 1571, Elizabeth rewarded, in some slight degree, her most able and faithful minister, Sir William Cecil, by raising him to the peerage, under the title of Baron Burghley or Burleigh.

Before entering on the next period of the reign of Elizabeth, we would impress it on the mind of the reader, that the policy of the queen and her ministers was purely defensive. The whole Catholic world might be said to be banded against her: there was a Catholic claimant of her throne, and a large portion of her subjects were of that persuasion. A standing army was then unknown in England; the chief security, therefore, lay in prevention; and hence recourse was had to the employment of spies, opening and deciphering letters, and various other expedients, which may be easily placed in an odious light, so as to represent the whole policy of the government as being a system of intrigue and machination. In fact, the danger was at times so imminent, that Elizabeth's ablest and wisest ministers were, to use Burleigh's words, almost "driven to the end of their wits;" and we might, without superstition, see a special Providence in the preservation of the religion and independence of England at this most critical period.

## CHAPTER XI.

## ELIZABETH (CONTINUED).

1571-1587.

Religious Parties.—Trial and Execution of Norfolk.—Massacre of St. Bartholomew ; its Consequences.—Sir Francis Drake.—Elizabeth's Coquetry with the Duke of Anjou.—Persecution of the Catholics.—Affairs of Scotland.—Danger of Elizabeth.—Dr. Parry.—The Queen aids the Dutch.—Babington's Conspiracy.—Trial of the Queen of Scots.—Conduct of Elizabeth.—Execution of the Queen of Scots.—Behaviour of Elizabeth after it.

THE important relations between the queens of England and Scotland have hitherto occupied our attention almost exclusively. We must now take a view of the state of religious parties in England and on the Continent.

The first ten years of Elizabeth's reign were styled her "halcyon days," as being free from disturbance, domestic or foreign : but, from the moment of the arrival of the Queen of Scots in England, this tranquillity was at an end. Thenceforward the authority, and even the life, of Elizabeth were assailed by conspiracies founded in religious fanaticism, and renewed without ceasing.

In those days religion was a matter of paramount importance in politics ; and the strength of parties in a state was to be estimated by the number and influence of those who agreed in religious sentiments. There were three parties of this kind now in England : the Catholics, the Churchmen, and the Puritans, as those who affected an extreme purity in religion, and held that the Reformation had not gone far enough, were called.

It is the opinion of Hume, that "of all the European churches which shook off the yoke of papal authority, no one proceeded with so much reason and

Vol. III.—F



moderation as the Church of England." "The fabric," he adds, "of the secular hierarchy was maintained entire; the ancient liturgy was preserved, so far as was thought consistent with the new principles; many ceremonies, become venerable from age and preceding use, were retained; the splendour of the Romish worship, though removed, had at least given place to order and decency; the distinctive habits of the clergy, according to their different ranks, were continued; no innovation was admitted merely from opposition to former usage. And the new religion, by mitigating the genius of the ancient superstition, and rendering it more compatible with the peace and interests of society, had preserved itself in that happy medium which wise men have always sought, and which the people have so seldom been able to maintain."

Some of the effects of this moderation were felt in the early part of Elizabeth's reign: for the Catholics in general made little scruple of attending the church service, where, though they might regret the absence of some things, there was little to offend them. Had they been left to themselves, they would probably have been gradually weaned from their superstitions; but the court of Rome, by sending missionary priests about to assure them that such conduct was impious; and the conduct of the Puritans, in urging measures of severity against them, both contributed to make them remain in their old faith.\*

\* "From the first year of Queen Elizabeth till the eleventh," says Sir Edward Coke, "all papists came to our church without scruple. I myself have seen Cornwallis, Bedingfield, and others at church, so that then for the space of ten years they made no conscience nor doubt to communicate with us in prayer. But when once the bull of Pope Pius Quintus was come and published, wherein the queen was accursed and deposed, and her subjects discharged of their obedience and oath, yea, cursed if they did not obey her; then did they all forthwith refrain the church; then would they have no society with us in prayer: so that recusancy in them is not for religion, but in an acknowledgment of the pope's power, and a plain manifestation what their judgment is concerning the right of the prince in respect of regal power and place."—Jardine's Criminal Trial, ii., 132.

The Puritans, though as a party they first acquired strength in the present reign, may be regarded as co-eval with the Reformation. They were those men of an ardent, uncompromising temper, who thought they could never recede too far from the Church of Rome. The clerical habits, the surplice, tippet, and square cap, retained in the Anglican church, were intolerable in their sight; and they viewed with equal aversion the use of the cross in baptism, of the ring in marriage, of the organ in the divine service, and the practice of kneeling at the communion. When the excellent Hooper was to be raised to the see of Gloucester, in Edward's reign, he positively refused to put on the episcopal robes, and for his contumacy was committed to the Tower, according to the practice of the age. Bucer, Peter Martyr, and other foreign divines, were consulted on this occasion; and at length he consented to wear the robes at his consecration and during cathedral service, but only at such times. When the Marian persecution forced so many of the Reformers to fly, they were received with great kindness by the Calvinists abroad; and this confirmed them in their desire for simple, anti-Romish forms. The more learned and pious portion of the clergy in Elizabeth's reign may be reckoned of this party; the better part of the Protestant gentry belonged to it, as was evident by the composition of the houses of commons; it was favoured by Leicester and Walsingham among the queen's ministers; and Burleigh himself was not adverse to it.\* The Puritans were, in fact, the main

\* The Puritans may be considered as having first made themselves known as a distinct religious body in the reign of Edward VI. Their numbers gradually increased during that and the following reign of Mary; but it was only after the accession of Elizabeth, and the consequent return of a multitude of religious exiles, who had fled to the Continent to escape from the persecutions of her sister's government, and who, during their absence, had resided mostly in Switzerland, where the doctrines of Calvin were generally received, that they acquired any considerable importance as a party in the state; and now they speedily became so powerful, that, in the convocation assembled in 1562, they had nearly a majority in the lower house.—*Am. Ed.*

support of Protestantism in England, and the most determined foes of the Queen of Scots. But Archbishop Parker, no less unwisely than unjustly, employed persecution against them; so that they gradually receded from the church, though many of them, according to the spirit of the times, maintained the supremacy of the spiritual over the civil authority in terms but little befitting the strenuous asserters of the rights of conscience.

The church party was the weakest of the three. Its main supports were the queen herself and the primate. Elizabeth regarded her spiritual supremacy as the brightest jewel in her crown, and would not be dictated to on that head. She was also partial to the splendour of public worship, and had a lurking tendency to some of the Romish doctrines. She long kept a crucifix, with tapers burning before it, in her chapel; she inclined much to the doctrine of the real presence;\* and was with difficulty restrained from prohibiting the marriage of the clergy.

Such was the state of parties in England. In France and Flanders the Protestants, though a minority, were numerous and active. Persecution to no small extent had been employed, without effect, against them; Charles V. had "hanged, beheaded, buried alive, or burned" fifty thousand Protestants according to Father Paul, or twice that number according to Grotius, in the Netherlands; and Francis I. and his successor had laboured to suppress the Reformation in France. In the summer of the year 1565, a meeting, at the desire of the pope, took place at Bayonne, between Charles IX. and his sister, the Queen of Spain: the former accompanied by his mother, and the latter by the Duke of Alva. Festivities occupied the day; and at midnight, Catharine and Alva, it is said, sat in

\* This throws doubt on the story of her eluding Gardiner, in her sister's reign, by these well-known verses:

"Christ was the word that spake it;  
He took the bread and brake it,  
And what that word did make it,  
That I believe, and take it."

secret conclave to discuss the mode of suppressing Protestantism. To cut off its chiefs, openly or secretly, was Alva's plan. "One salmon's head," he would say, "is worth a thousand frogs." The principle was agreed on between them, and the mode of carrying it into execution was left to the course of events.

In 1568 Alva was sent with a large army to the Low Countries, where he exercised such tyranny and cruelty as eventually drove the people to insurrection. In France the Protestants, styled Huguenots,\* were headed by the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, the Admiral Coligni, and others; the Guises were at the head of the other party; and the queen-mother and the king played them against each other. Recourse was frequently had to arms; and Elizabeth had, on more occasions than one, assisted the Huguenots with money, and even with men.

In the beginning of this year, 1571, a parliament met, after an interval of five years. The Puritan party were strong in it; and some members, especially Strickland and Paul Wentworth, ventured to express themselves very firmly in opposition to the crown. Though the question of the queen's marriage was left untouched, the greatest zeal was manifested for her person and authority. The first act passed was one making it treason to affirm that she was not the lawful sovereign, or that the laws cannot limit and determine the right to the crown and the succession; while to maintain that any person except her *natural issue* is or ought to be her heir or successor, was made an offence punishable by fine and imprisonment, and the second time by *præmunire*. It was also made treason to publish papal bulls, absolutions, etc., or to reconcile any one or be reconciled to the Church of Rome. To import crucifixes, *agnus Dei*, or other Romish devices, subjected the offender to the penalty of a *præmunire*.

\* This word is said to be a corruption of the German *Eidgenossen*, i. e., *Conjurati*, associates.

The weak, ill-advised Duke of Norfolk, it was soon discovered, was still persisting in his treasonable projects. Mary's agent, the Bishop of Ross ; Ridolfi, an Italian trader, employed by Mary and Norfolk as their medium of communication with Alva and the pope ; and the duke's secretary and two of his confidential servants, having been arrested, it appeared from their confessions that a plan had been arranged that the Duke of Alva should land with ten thousand men at Harwich, where he was to be joined by Norfolk and his friends, and they were then to march to London, and force the queen to consent to Norfolk's marriage with the Queen of Scots, and to repeal the laws against the Catholics. Norfolk, who knew not of the discoveries which had been made, was summoned before the council : he denied everything ; and the queen, who (as she always declared) would have pardoned him if he had confessed his guilt, committed him to the Tower on the 7th of September. On the 16th of January, 1572, he was brought to trial before the lord-steward and twenty-six peers. The cause was conducted with perfect fairness, according to the mode then in use ; and he defended himself with spirit and eloquence, but the peers unanimously pronounced him guilty. In various supplicatory letters which he afterward wrote to the queen, the duke acknowledged the justice of the verdict.

The conduct of Elizabeth on this occasion tends much to elucidate her character, proving her aversion to bloodshed, and inducing us to believe that her behaviour in a similar case, some years later, was not mere hypocrisy. Norfolk's guilt was great and clear ; yet she could not bring herself to put him to death. Burleigh writes to Walsingham, on the 11th of February, thus : " I cannot write to you what is the inward cause of the stay of the Duke of Norfolk's death, only that I find her majesty diversely disposed. Sometimes, when she speaketh of her danger, she concludes that justice should be done. Another time, when she speaks of his nearness of blood, of his superiority of honour, etc., she stayeth. On

Saturday she signed a warrant for his execution. On Monday all preparations were made, and concourse of thousands yesterday morning; but suddenly on Sunday, late in the night, she sent for me and entered into great misliking that the duke should die the next day; and said she was and should be disquieted, and would have a new warrant made that night to the sheriffs to forbear." Again (April 9) she signed a warrant, but she revoked it after midnight.

The queen's repugnance to shed the blood of her kinsman and the first of her nobles was such, that even Leicester gave it as his opinion that no execution would take place. But Burleigh and the other ministers pressed it; the commons, when they assembled, petitioned for it; the preachers were importunate; and plots to liberate the prisoner were detected. A third warrant was not revoked; and, on the 2d of June, nearly five months after his trial, the duke was led to execution.

On the scaffold Norfolk acknowledged the justice of his sentence, and declared his attachment to the Protestant faith. He died with constancy and resignation, amid the tears of the by-standers: for his noble birth, his popular and engaging manners, and his munificent temper, had endeared him to the people. His ambition, united to weakness of character, had made him a tool in the hands of an artful woman\* and the wily court of Rome, and brought him, eventually, to an untimely end. He certainly never dreamed of dethroning or injuring Queen Elizabeth, and by her the necessity of his death was sincerely lamented.†

Abundant proofs had now been given of the share

\* Though she had never seen him, her "political love-letters," as they have justly been called, are conceived in terms of the strongest affection.

† "The queen," writes Burleigh (June 6), "is somewhat sad for the Duke of Norfolk's death." Two years after, when his sister, Lady Berkeley, knelt to ask a favour of her, "No, no, my Lady Berkeley," she said, in haste, "we know you never will love us for the death of your brother."

of the Queen of Scots in all the conspiracies against Elizabeth; and Burleigh and other ministers had long been of opinion, that nothing but her death would give security to the nation. The parliament resolved to proceed against her by bill of attainder: but the queen positively forbade it. A bill was then introduced and passed to make her incapable of succession: but the queen defeated this also by a prorogation on the 25th of June.

In Scotland the lords of Mary's party had, on the 4th of September in the preceding year, seized and put to death the regent Lennox. The Earl of Mar succeeded: but he died shortly after, and Morton was appointed regent. The lords of the queen's party laid down their arms on receiving an indemnity; and the regent, with the aid of Sir William Drury, governor of Berwick, reduced the castle of Edinburgh, which was held by Kirkcaldy of Grange and Lethington. The former was tried and executed, and the latter died in prison by his own hand, as was generally believed.

On the eve of St. Bartholomew, an atrocity, without parallel in history, was perpetrated in the French capital. All the leaders of the Protestant party had been invited thither, on the occasion of the marriage of the young King of Navarre, their ostensive head, with Margaret, sister of Charles IX. The marriage was celebrated on the 18th of August; and four days after, on the 22d, the Admiral Coligni was fired at and wounded from the window of a house belonging to a dependant of the Duke of Guise. Next day the king, the queen-mother, and the court, came to visit him. After midnight the tocsin sounded, and the Protestants were fallen on and massacred in their beds. The admiral, his son-in-law Teligni, Rochefoucauld, and nearly one thousand more of the nobles and gentry, and five thousand other Protestants, perished.\* The

\* In describing this horrible scene, Sir James Mackintosh says: "Massacre and pillage went on with intermittent fury for eight days and nights. Catholics were involved in the slaughter. Private interests and personal animosities borrowed the poniard and

King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé saved their lives only by a change of religion. Similar massacres were perpetrated at Orleans, Rouen, Lyons, and other cities, in the course of the succeeding month. They closed with one at Bordeaux on the 4th of October. The number of victims thus immolated to the demon of fanaticism is variously estimated at from 10,000 to 100,000: the Duke de Sully gives the number at 70,000, and the accurate and veracious Thuanus at 30,000. Medals were struck, and an annual procession and thanksgiving was appointed, to commemorate this horrible event at Paris. The tidings were received with every demonstration of joy at Madrid and in the camp of Alva; and at Rome the pope and cardinals went to return thanks to Heaven for this event in the church of St. Louis.

What connexion this atrocious deed had with the meeting at Bayonne, how long it had been premeditated, and by whom, and whether the young king was guilty or not of the fiendish dissimulation with which he has been charged, are questions into which we cannot now enter. We incline, however, to think that Charles really was deceived by his mother and her confederates; and was made to believe that the Huguenots had formed a dangerous conspiracy, which could be repressed only by anticipating it.

The French ambassador in England, La Motte Feneelon, was instructed to make this excuse to Elizabeth. He repaired to Woodstock, where the court was then residing. When admitted to an audience, he was led through apartments in which a silence like to that of the tomb prevailed. The lords and ladies, habited in deep mourning, took no notice of him as he passed. Elizabeth herself, however, listened to his excuses with calmness: she then showed how inadequate they

the mask of religious fury, and (*ſebile ludibrium*, deplorable mockery) the logic of the schools shed blood. Peter Ramus, the antistagirite, was massacred by his antagonist Charpentier." Catharine of Medicis herself gave the signal for the dreadful tocsin to be sounded, and the sanguinary Guise in person directed the slaughter.—*Am. Ed.*



were, and expressed a desire that the king should institute an inquiry, and, if the charge were found to be a calumny, that he would condignly punish the authors of it. Her opinion of the king's intentions, she added, would be regulated by his conduct on the occasion. Only two days before the massacre, Fenelon had proposed to her a marriage with the Duke of Alençon, Charles's youngest brother, though a youth of but seventeen years. She still permitted the negotiation to go on; and when Charles soon after had a daughter born to him, she accepted an invitation to stand godmother, and sent the Earl of Worcester, a Catholic nobleman, to represent her at the christening.

This temporizing policy seemed forced upon Elizabeth by the circumstances of the times. Every day gave fresh proof of the determination of the Catholic powers to exterminate the Reformers. Should Charles succeed in France, and Philip in the Netherlands, England might be the next object of attack; and the claim of the Queen of Scots would then be supported by foreign armies. It was therefore the interest of the English queen to neutralize, if possible, one of these sovereigns. Burleigh, Walsingham, and the other statesmen considered the death of Mary, therefore, to be absolutely necessary for the safety of Elizabeth. Sandys, bishop of London, writing at this time to Burleigh on the state of affairs, suggested, as one of the precautionary measures that should be taken, "furthwith to cutte off the Scottish quene's heade;" and Henry Killigrew was sent into Scotland on the 7th of September, to propose to the then regent Mar to deliver her up to him and his party, provided "they should give good assurance to proceed with her by way of justice, as they had already many times offered to do." It is assumed that the upright character of Mar was the cause of this measure not being carried into effect: but, as he died, and was immediately succeeded by Morton, viz., on the 9th of November, we may, with perhaps more probability, ascribe it to Elizabeth's aversion to bloodshed.\*

\* The object of sending Killigrew to Scotland was, in plain

The apprehended storm, however, did not burst upon England. The Huguenots, quickly recovering from the stupor into which the massacre had thrown them, resumed their arms; while Elizabeth connived at money and men being sent to them out of England. In a similar indirect manner she aided the Prince of Orange and the Protestants of the Netherlands. In 1574, Charles IX. died of a dreadful disease, and in all the horrors of remorse; the Duke of Anjou, who had been elected King of Poland, succeeding him, under the name of Henry III. The King of Navarre and Prince of Condé effecting their escape, resumed the Protestant religion, and became the heads of the Huguenots; and, having been joined by the Duke of Alençon, now Anjou, the king, in 1576, granted them most favourable terms. The Catholics, in the mean time, entered into a confederation styled the LEAGUE, headed by the Guises, in concert with the King of Spain.

During all this time the utmost tranquillity prevailed in England: the Queen of Scots, hopeless of aid from her own country (where the regent Morton merely ruled under Elizabeth), or from the Catholic princes, seems to have abstained from her machinations; and the Catholics in general, connived at in their private worship, remained at rest. Elizabeth, in those stately progresses through her kingdom which she was in the habit of making every year, found the means of extending her popularity, and endearing herself to all orders of her people. Commercial and maritime enterprise much engaged the public mind.

English, to induce the regent Mar to become the Scottish queen's executioner, and thus save Elizabeth and her government from the odium of being the immediate instruments of her death. A more base and wicked intrigue can scarcely be imagined; and it is one which, to use the language of an impartial and able writer, "throws a melancholy light upon the character of Burleigh and the councils of Elizabeth." As to "Elizabeth's aversion to bloodshed," however strong it might have been generally, it certainly appears in a very questionable shape on this occasion; and it is to be regretted that our author has been able to produce no better evidence of her innocence in this transaction.—*Am. Ed.*

A trade was established with the Levant ; mercantile intercourse with Russia, which had commenced in the late reign, was maintained ; various efforts were made to reach the East by the North of Europe or America ; and, so early as 1567, Martin Frobisher penetrated to the sea afterward named Hudson's Bay. Other adventurers pursued a more lucrative but less honourable course. John Hawkins, a gentleman of Devon, for example, fitted out vessels with which he proceeded to the coast of Africa, and there seizing the inoffensive natives, sold them for slaves to the Spaniards in America.\*

But the individual who most distinguished himself by maritime enterprise at this time was Francis Drake. The father of this great navigator was a man in humble circumstances in Devon, who, having embraced the reformed doctrines in the time of Henry VIII., found it necessary, on account of the Six Articles, to remove into Kent. In the reign of Edward VI. he obtained orders, and was made vicar of Upnore, near Chatham, on the Medway. He apprenticed his son Francis to a neighbour of his, the master of a bark, who, on his death, left his ship to the youth. In 1567, Drake sold his vessel and went and joined Hawkins, then about to sail on an expedition to America : but in the Bay of St. Juan de Ulloa they were attacked by a superior Spanish force and defeated. Drake thus lost his all : but, "by

\* We see here the first mention in English history of this detestable traffic. Hawkins has recorded his own infamy by furnishing the details of his expeditions. We give the following in his own words, as a specimen of the barbarities committed in the prosecution of this horrible trade. "A negroe," he says, "came to us, sent by a negroe king oppressed by other kings his neighbours, desiring our aid, with a promise that as many negroes as might by these wars be obtained should be at our pleasure. I went myself, and, with the assistance of the king of our side, assaulted the town by land and sea, and *very hardly with fire* (the huts being covered with dry palm-leaves), and, out of 8000 souls, seized 250 persons, men, women, and children." The same or worse enormities have characterized this frightful traffic ever since.—*Am. Ed.*

playing the seaman and the pirate" for some years, he retrieved his fortune. A chaplain in the navy having satisfied him as to the lawfulness of his design, he set sail with a man-of-war named the Dragon, and two pinnaces, in 1572, and attacked and took the town of Nombre de Dios, on the Isthmus of Panama. Having been informed by some Cimarrons (runaway negroes) of the approach of a caravan of mules with treasure from Panama, he waylaid and plundered it. As he was roaming over the isthmus under the guidance of the Cimarrons, they showed him, from the top of a mountain, the Pacific Ocean. He fell on his knees, made a vow to visit that sea, and implored the Divine aid for his enterprise.

On the 13th of December, 1577, Drake sailed from Plymouth with five ships, carrying one hundred and sixty-three men. Having on his way taken the crews and stores out of two of his ships, which he then turned adrift, he passed Magellan's Straits with the remaining three. A violent tempest coming on, dispersed them; one returned through the straits, and another was lost. With the third Drake proceeded along the coast of Chili and Peru, making descents and plundering the ships which he found in harbour or at sea; for, as an enemy had never appeared in these parts, the Spaniards were without any suspicion of danger. But the alarm being now given, he feared to return by the way he had come, and he therefore boldly stretched across the ocean westward, and reached the Moluccas, whence he proceeded to Java, and thence to the Cape of Good Hope. He landed at Plymouth on the 3d of November, 1580, after an absence of nearly three years. He then went round to the Thames, and his ship was laid up at Deptford, where the queen condescended to partake of a banquet on board, and conferred on him the honour of knighthood. The amount of his plunder was 800,000*l.* (\$3,840,000), a tenth of which was divided among the officers and crew of the ship. A large sum was afterward paid over to a Spaniard, representing himself as the agent for those who had been plundered; and the

VOL. III.—G

queen learned, when too late, that, instead of being given to the real owners, it was employed in payment of the troops in the Netherlands.

The treaty for a marriage of the queen with the Duke of Anjou still went on. In 1578, this prince sent over one Simier, a man of wit and capacity, as his agent; and Simier made himself so agreeable to Elizabeth, that Leicester began to fear she would overcome her aversion to matrimony, and that he should thus lose his influence over her. He therefore, to injure Simier in her opinion, insinuated that he had bewitched her with magic arts; while Simier, in revenge, informed the queen of a matter which Leicester had studiously concealed from her, namely, that he had been privately married to the widow of Lord Essex. Elizabeth, whose aversion to matrimony was not confined to herself, was so enraged, that, but for the intercession of Lord Sussex, his personal enemy, she would have sent him to the Tower. Leicester was now accused of having employed one Tudor, of the queen's guard, to assassinate Simier. It happened, too, as the queen was rowing one day in her barge on the Thames, in company with Simier and some others, that a shot was fired by a young man in a boat which wounded one of her bargemen. A design to murder herself or Simier was at once supposed; but the young man, having proved that the piece went off by accident, was pardoned at the gallows. Elizabeth, on this as on several other occasions, observed, that she would believe nothing of her people which parents would not believe of their own children.

Anjou himself came over soon after, and had a private interview with Elizabeth at Greenwich; and it is rather curious, that, though she was such an admirer of personal beauty, and the duke's face had been sadly disfigured by the smallpox, she was so far pleased with him that she seems to have had serious thoughts of marrying him. After a month or two she directed Burleigh, Sussex, Leicester, Hatton, and Walsingham to confer with Simier on the subject.

The acquisition of the crown and dominions of Portugal by Philip of Spain in 1580, made the court of France most anxious for a close connexion with that of England. A splendid embassy was accordingly sent thither in 1581, to treat of the marriage. Elizabeth's heart was certainly in favour of the duke; marriage-articles were actually agreed on, and the union was to take place in six weeks. A clause, however, was added, which would enable her to recede if she chose.

The truth is, there was a violent struggle in the queen's breast between prudence and inclination. Anjou had certainly made an impression on her heart; and her pride was gratified at the prospect of an alliance with the royal house of France. On the other hand, her good sense suggested to her the folly of a woman in her forty-ninth year marrying a young man; and her subjects in general, and several of her ministers, were adverse to a connexion with the blood-stained house of Valois: they were, indeed, in consideration of her age, little anxious for her marriage at all. An honest but vehement Puritan of Lincoln's Inn, named Stubbs, wrote a book, entitled, "The Gulf in which England will be swallowed by the French Marriage." The queen caused him and the printer, and one Page who circulated it, to be prosecuted, under an act passed in her sister's reign; and they were sentenced to lose their right hands. The sentence was executed on Stubbs and Page; when the former, loyal in the face even of such injustice and cruelty, instantly took off his hat with his remaining hand, and, waving it over his head, cried, "God save the queen!"\* A person of much higher rank than poor Stubbs also wrote against the marriage: Sir Philip Sidney, the gallant warrior and accomplished scholar, addressed an able and elegant letter to the queen on the subject.

Anjou was at this time in the Netherlands. The

\* Burleigh often afterward employed Stubbs in answering the Romish libellers; and, as he was obliged to write with his left hand, he always signed himself Scæva.

people of the provinces in revolt had some years before, in 1575, offered the sovereignty, of which they declared Philip deprived, to the Queen of England. She had prudently declined it then; and, when it was again offered to her in 1580, she persisted in her resolution. It was next proffered to the Duke of Anjou; and his brother permitted him to accept it, and secretly supplied him with money. He entered the Netherlands with about fifteen thousand men, and forced the Spaniards to raise the siege of Cambray; while Elizabeth, to prove her regard for him, sent him a present of 100,000 crowns. At the close of the campaign he came over to England, where his reception by the queen was most flattering. A few days after the anniversary of her accession, on the 22d of November, she, in the presence of her court, drew a ring from her finger and placed it on his, in token of pledging herself to him. The affair was now regarded as decided; the envoy from the Netherlands wrote off instantly; and public rejoicings were had at Antwerp and other towns. But Leicester, Hatton, and Walsingham, who were strongly opposed to the match, remonstrated earnestly with Elizabeth; and when she retired, her ladies of the bedchamber fell on their knees, and with sighs and tears conjured her to pause, representing the evil consequences that might ensue. She passed a sleepless and uneasy night, and the next morning had a long conversation with the duke, in which she stated to him her reasons for sacrificing her inclinations to the duty she owed her people. He withdrew, greatly mortified, to his apartments, flinging away the ring, and exclaiming against the fickleness of women and islanders. Still he remained in England till the following year, the queen continuing to give him hopes. When at length he departed, on the 8th of February, she made him promise to return in a month; accompanied him herself as far as Canterbury; and sent Leicester and a gallant train to attend him even to Brussels. He was now made Duke of Brabant and Earl of Flanders: but, attempting some time after to make himself absolute, he was driven out of the coun-

try, and died in France in 1584, after a tedious illness, lamented by Elizabeth, who really loved him, though his character seems to have been not less vicious than that of the rest of the family. A union with him would certainly have been productive neither of advantage nor happiness to the queen or her people.

The laws against *recusants*, as the Catholics were now called, were at this time put into more rigorous execution than heretofore; and by a new act in 1581, a penalty of £20 a month was imposed on those who absented themselves from church, provided they heard not the English service at home.\* We are no advocates of persecution: but, in relation to these measures, we may ask that the queen and her council should be judged by the maxims of the sixteenth, and not by those of the nineteenth century; and that she should not be lightly condemned for employing means sanctioned by the practice of the age for counteracting the plots of the pope and King of Spain to overthrow the Protestant religion in England, and deprive her of her crown and life. The laws passed for her protection and the security of the Reformed religion were certainly most severe, and, according to our ideas, most unjust: but it is to be remembered that those against whom they were directed had never, where they had the power, shown any symptoms of a tolerating spirit; and that, therefore, if they chose to violate these laws, their punishment, on their own principles, was not unmerited.†

\* This is said by Sir Edward Coke to be the first general law against recusants. "There was no law," says he, "made against recusants till the 23d year of her majesty's reign, when a mild law was made, that they should either come to church or pay 20*l.* a month for refusing to do so; which, indeed, was too easy a law, considering the many bloody plots of the Papists against the queen."—Jardine's *Crim. Trials*, ii., 246. This shows the feelings of the times.

† It is worse than vain to attempt to apologize for the execution of these barbarous laws. Precedent can never justify wrong. Sir James Mackintosh, in speaking of the policy pursued by Elizabeth's government at this time, very justly remarks, that "when she made the exercise of his functions by a Roman Catholic priest a service of life or death, she held out England as a tempting and



There were two classes of Romish priests who sought the glory of martyrdom in England: the Jesuits and the Seminary-priests. The society of the former, the most able support of the pretensions of the papacy, had been founded in the time of Charles V. Its general or chief resided at Rome, and its members were everywhere blindly obedient to his mandates. So many enormities were at this time perpetrated or instigated by Jesuits, that we fear their principles justified crimes committed in the cause of Rome. The Seminary-priests were a better sort of men. Fearing that when Queen Mary's priests (as the Catholic clergy still remaining in England were called) should die off, the people would conform to the Protestant religion for the want of teachers of their own, William Allen, who had been a fellow of Oxford, conceived the design of forming seminaries on the Continent for the education of missionaries to be sent to England. The pope approved of the project, and contributed money for its support. Allen opened the first seminary at Douay in 1568; and others were afterward established at Rome, Valladolid, and elsewhere. Zealous English Catholics secretly sent their children to be educated at these institutions, in order that they might return as missionaries to teach the doctrines of their church, and inculcate what the English government regarded as rebellion, that the queen should be deposed as a heretic.

The first who suffered was a priest named Maine, in Cornwall, in 1577. He was charged with having obtained a bull from Rome, with having denied the queen's supremacy, and with saying mass in a private house; and he was executed at Launceston as a traitor. Mr. Tregian, the gentleman in whose house he was taken, suffered the penalty of a *præmunire*; his estate was seized, and he was kept in prison till his

exclusive theatre to the missionary zeal of desperadoes and fanatics." Elizabeth's security would doubtless have been increased rather than diminished by pursuing a more humane and liberal course, for persecution always recoils on those who practise it. But such, unhappily, were not the sentiments of that age.—*Am. Ed.*

death. The next year, Nelson, a priest, and Sherwood, a layman, were executed for denying the supremacy.

In 1580 the Jesuits made their first appearance in England. Persons and Campian, both formerly of the University of Oxford, where they had professed Protestantism, but who were now members of the society of the Jesuits, came over, and under various disguises, as soldiers, Protestant ministers, etc., went through the country confirming the Catholics in their religion. A chief part of their commission was to quiet the minds of the scrupulous, by giving them the sense put by Gregory XIII. on the bull of Pius V., viz., that it was always binding on Elizabeth and the heretics, but not on the Catholics, till they could put it in execution: that is to say, they were to obey the queen until they should be able to depose her. The notions on this point advanced by Persons were, however, so offensive to many Catholics even, that they had thoughts of seizing him and giving him up to the government.\* Campian, a far better man, put forth papers offering to dispute on the points in controversy before the universities.

A diligent search was now set on foot; and, after a year's pursuit, Campian was taken and committed to the Tower. According to the barbarous practice of the age, he was put to the rack; and, during his torture, he revealed the names of several of those who had received him into their houses. He and twelve other priests were then indicted under the 25th Edward III. According to the printed account of it, nothing could be more unfair than the manner in which the trial was conducted, and nothing more feeble than

\* The Catholics, says Camden, "to speak it upon their own assurance, repudiated the tenets and the turbulence of Persons, whom they threatened to denounce;" and if this be true, of which there appears to be little doubt, it shows that Elizabeth's Catholic subjects, as a body, were disinclined to violent measures, and thus takes away all excuse for treating them with so much severity. Persecution, however, will make enemies, and most bitter and inveterate ones, at all times.—*Am. Ed.*

the evidence given.\* They were, however, found guilty; and Campian and two others were executed forthwith, and seven of the rest some months after. It is impossible not to feel pity for the fate of these, we may believe, upright, well-meaning men: but we must at the same time recollect, that, however they might disguise it from themselves, their ultimate object was the overthrow of the government; for there was probably not one of them who did not deem it a duty to depose Elizabeth and place Mary on the throne. They would not, indeed, have been Jesuits, or even Catholics, unless they had so believed; and, if sincerity and honest intention are to excuse conspiracy, governments would often find it difficult to justify themselves in punishing rebels.

Affairs in Scotland at this time caused some uneasiness to the English cabinet. Morton, though his vigorous rule kept the country quiet, gave great offence by his harshness and avarice. He at length resigned his authority, in 1578, into the hands of the king, now in his thirteenth year, and the royal child seemed to administer the government; but Morton soon recovered his influence. The following year, however, the Guise party sent Stuart, lord of Aubigny, over to Scotland; and his amiable manners soon won the heart of James, who created him Earl, and afterward Duke, of Lennox. Another favourite was Stewart of Ochiltree, afterward Earl of Arran. These two combined against Morton, and at their instigation he was brought to trial, in 1581, for the murder of the king's father. He was found guilty, and was executed, in spite of the exertions of Elizabeth, the King of Navarre, and the Prince of Orange to save him. His execution only proves the boldness and ambition of Arran, and not the filial piety of James.†

\* Hallam is of opinion that the account of the trial was "compiled by a partial hand." The witnesses were confronted with Campian, which was not usual.

† Elizabeth justly said to the Bishop of St. Andrew's, "I wonder that James has had the Earl of Morton executed, as guilty of the death of the king his father, and that he requires Archibald

The Jesuits resolved to take advantage of the death of Morton and the influence of the Catholic Lennox. Waytes, an English priest, and Creighton, a Scottish Jesuit, appeared at Holyrood House. James received them favourably; and, as he complained of want of money, it was hoped, by supplying him with it, to gain him over to their projects. Persons and Creighton repaired to Paris, where they secretly consulted with the Duke of Guise, the papal nuncio, the provincial of the Jesuits, the Spanish ambassador, Mary's agent, the Bishop of Glasgow, and Dr. Allén, the founder of the seminaries. It was agreed that Mary and James should be associated in the throne; and that the pope and the King of Spain should be solicited to supply him with money.\* The plan was communicated to Mary, who approved of it, as also, it is said, did Lennox and Arran, and James himself. But the "Raid of Ruthven," as it was called, disconcerted all their projects. James was seized by the Earl of Gowrie, in concert with some of the leading Protestants, and forced to dismiss Lennox and Arran: the former of whom retired to France, where he died soon after, the latter was cast into prison. Whether the English council were cognisant of the Raid or not, is uncertain. They knew of the consultation in Paris, and of its objects; and how vital it was to England that the supreme power in Scotland should be in the hands of Protestants. Sir Henry Carey and Sir Robert Bowes were sent to congratulate James on his deliverance from the counsels of Lennox and Arran, to exhort him not to resent the late seeming violence, and to procure the recall of the Earl of Angus. James readily assented to the return of Angus; and he likewise dissembled his resentment against his captors. Mary at this time wrote a long letter to Elizabeth, of which

Douglas to be given up, in order to treat him in the same manner. *Why does he not desire his mother to be given up, in order to punish her for that crime?*"—Castelnau, Letters to the Queen of Scots in 1584.

\* "It is probable," says Lingard, "that other projects, with which we are unacquainted, were also formed." No doubt the dethronement of Elizabeth was one.

no notice seemed to be taken : for the queen was well aware of her machinations.\*

By a bold effort James succeeded, in 1583, in freeing himself from the restraint in which he was held. Most of the opposite party quitted the kingdom, and Arran recovered his influence. Elizabeth, desirous of knowing accurately the character of the young monarch, sent the aged and sagacious Walsingham on an embassy to his court. James, who had been the pupil of the illustrious Buchanan, and had naturally good parts, shone in conversation, and Walsingham conceived an opinion of his abilities beyond what they were entitled to. The tyranny of Arran soon, however, caused his downfall; and the English party regained their ascendancy in the Scottish council, to the great satisfaction of Elizabeth. On Arran's return to power, the conclave at Paris had proposed that James should invade the northern counties, while Guise landed with an army in the south of England, to liberate Mary and dethrone Elizabeth. It would appear to be the knowledge of this plan that made the queen take notice of a renewed proposal of Mary for transferring all her authority to her son if she were set at liberty. For Creighton, on his return to Scotland at this time, being taken by a Dutch cruiser, tore his papers and threw them into the sea; but, the wind blowing them back, they were recovered, and, being put together, revealed the plan for invading England. He was given up to the English government; and, after being menaced with the rack, made a full disclosure of the plot.

The government had so many proofs of the foreign and domestic conspiracy in favour of the Queen of Scots, that they found it needful to have recourse to

\* "If the Queen of Scotland," said she to Castelnau in January, 1583, "had had any one else to deal with, she would have lost her head long ago. She has a correspondence with rebels in England, agents in Paris, Rome, and Madrid, and carries on plots against me all over Christendom, the object of which (as messengers who have been taken confess) is, to deprive me of my kingdom and my life."

every possible expedient for discovering those concerned in it. In a moral point of view, the employment of spies is doubtless reprehensible ; but in times of danger, few if any governments have yet been found to abstain from this mode of discovering and thwarting the designs of their enemies ; and never did ministers better know how to manage it than Cecil and Walsingham. Spies were now employed by them ; informers were listened to ; and the still more reprehensible expedient of sending counterfeit letters, in the name of the Queen of Scots or of the exiles, to the houses of suspected Catholics, was, it is said, resorted to. The information thus gained led to the arrest of two gentlemen named Throgmorton ; the Lord Paget and Charles Arundel immediately fled to France ; and the Earl of Northumberland, brother of the late earl, and the Earl of Arundel, son of the late Duke of Norfolk, were called before the council and examined. A letter to Mary on the subject of an insurrection having been intercepted, Francis Throgmorton was put to the rack ; he confessed that he had concerted the plan of an invasion and a rising of the Catholics with Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador. On his trial, however, he denied it ; after his condemnation he again admitted it, while on the scaffold he denied it once more. Mendoza was ordered to leave the kingdom, and retired to Paris, where he gratified his resentment by publishing falsehoods of the queen and her ministers, and by aiding every plan for exciting a rebellion in England.

The people at this time evinced the strongest affection for the queen. The French ambassador writes thus : " Queen Elizabeth has told me that several conspiracies, directed by the Jesuits, have been, by the goodness of God, discovered. Latterly, when she has appeared in public, whole crowds of people fell on their knees as she passed, prayed in various ways, invoked upon her a thousand blessings, and hoped that all her wicked enemies might be discovered and punished. She often stopped and returned thanks for this love. When I was alone with her (she rode on

a good horse) amid all this crowd, she said to me, 'You see that all do not wish me ill.' " A farther proof of this affection was shown in the zeal with which men of all ranks pressed forward to subscribe a bond of association, framed by Leicester and some others of the council for her security. Its object was to defend her person, avenge her death or any injury done to her, and to exclude from the throne all claimants for whose advantage or by whose suggestion any harm should befall her. The Queen of Scots saw plainly that she was the person aimed at; and, to remove suspicion, she begged that she might be allowed to subscribe the bond, but was refused. She was at this time at Wingfield, under the custody of Sir Ralph Sadler.

When parliament met on the 23d of November, a statute was passed "for the security of the queen's person and continuance of the realm in peace." It enacted that if any invasion or rebellion should be made by or for any person pretending a title to the crown after her majesty's decease, or if anything should be compassed or imagined tending to the hurt of her person with the privity of any such person, a certain number of peers and others, commissioned by the queen, should examine and give judgment thereon; and all persons against whom such judgment was published should be disabled for ever from claiming the crown. The design of this act was to obtain from the reluctant queen, in case of any rebellious movements, an absolute exclusion of Mary from the succession.

A most severe law also was passed against the Catholics. The Jesuits and priests were ordered to quit the kingdom within forty days; all who remained beyond that time, or who should return, were declared to be guilty of treason; such as harboured or relieved them, of felony; students at the seminaries were pronounced guilty of treason if they did not return within six months; and those supplying them with money were made liable to a *præmunire*, etc.

This bill was opposed by one Dr. Parry, a civilian, who described it as "a measure savouring of blood,

danger, and despair to English subjects." For this he was committed, but was released the next day by the queen's order. Soon after, however, he was sent to the Tower, being accused by Edmund Neville of a design to assassinate the queen. He acknowledged his guilt, and was condemned and executed as a traitor.

Parry's confession was in substance as follows. He was in the queen's service from 1570 to 1580, when, having attempted to kill a man to whom he was in debt, and being pardoned, he went to Paris, where he was reconciled to the Church of Rome. At Venice, some time after, he hinted to a Jesuit named Palmio that he had found a way to relieve the English Catholics, if the pope or any learned divines would justify it as lawful. Palmio extolled the project (which was to kill the queen) as a pious design; recommended him to the nuncio; and letters of safe conduct for Parry to go to Rome were sent by Cardinal Como. He returned, however, to Paris; and there conversing with his countryman Morgan, the agent of the Queen of Scots, he declared himself ready to kill the greatest subject in England in the cause of the church. "Why not the queen herself?" said Morgan. But of this Parry had now doubts, as Watts, an English priest, and Creighton, the Scottish Jesuit, assured him it was not lawful. The nuncio Ragazzoni, however, confirmed him in his design; and he received, after his return to England, a letter from Cardinal Como in the pope's name, commending his project and granting him absolution. He communicated this letter "to different persons in court," and had various interviews with the queen; on which occasions (such is the force of natural feelings) he always went unarmed, lest he might be tempted to injure her. A book, however, which Dr. Allen had lately written, confirmed him anew in his resolution; he communicated it to Neville, and they arranged their plan; but Lord Westmoreland happening to die at this time, Neville, in the hope of getting the family estates, betrayed his confederate.

Without stopping to inquire how far this confession  
VOL. III.—H



may be true or false, we will merely observe, that other occurrences of a kindred character at this time strongly support its credibility. On the 10th of July, 1584, the great Prince of Orange was shot by a man named Balthazar Gerard, who confessed that he had been kept for some time in the Jesuit's College at Treves by one of the brotherhood, who approved of his design, and instructed him how to proceed in it. Philip II. had set a large reward on the prince's head, and his great general, the Prince of Parma, sullied his fame by personally examining the qualifications of the assassins who presented themselves.

The Dutch were dismayed at the loss of their hero and at the rapid progress of the Prince of Parma; and they sent again, offering the sovereignty to Elizabeth. The matter was anxiously debated in the English council: the danger to the Protestant interest was imminent; Philip was in the zenith of his power; the League was nearly triumphant in France; and, if the Dutch should be subdued, England would certainly be attacked. Elizabeth resolved boldly to face the danger at once; and, as the King of Sweden observed when he heard of it, to take the diadem from her head and hazard it on the chance of war. She declined, however, the proffered sovereignty, but agreed, in 1585, to aid the States with a force of five thousand foot and one thousand horse, to be maintained at her expense during the war: the money thus expended to be repaid when peace should be concluded.

The chief command of this armament was given to the Earl of Leicester, who, though by no means deficient in courage or talents, was totally without military experience, and he was to be opposed by the first general of the age. He landed at Flushing on the 10th of December; accompanied by the gallant young Earl of Essex, his step-son, and a company of nobles, knights, and gentlemen to the number of five hundred. The States, in the expectation of gratifying Elizabeth by honouring her favourite, bestowed on him the title of Governor and Captain-general of the United Provinces, gave him a guard, and treated him almost like

a sovereign. But these proceedings were by no means pleasing to the queen; and she wrote in very angry terms, both to the earl and the States, and was not appeased without difficulty. "We little thought," she said, in her letter to Leicester, "that *one whom we have raised out of the dust*, and surrounded with singular honour above all others, would, with so great contempt, have broken our commandment in a matter of so great weight." Leicester's first campaign, in 1586, was not very brilliant; neither was it altogether so discreditable as is represented by writers hostile to his memory. The most unfortunate event of it was the death of his nephew, Sir Philip Sidney, the ornament of his age and country, and equally distinguished in arms, literature, and manners, the nearest approach, perhaps, to the ideal model of a perfect knight that has ever appeared.

This lamented event thus occurred. The Prince of Parma, having sent some troops to the relief of Zutphen, which Leicester had invested, they fell in with an inferior force of the besieging army. Sidney was among the latter; and, his horse having been killed under him, as he was mounting another a musket-ball struck him in the thigh. He therefore turned, and rode back to the main army. Loss of blood making him thirsty, he called for drink, when a bottle of water was given him: he put it to his lips, but, seeing a wounded soldier looking wistfully at it, he said, "Thy necessity is yet greater than mine," and handed it to him. After lingering for about three weeks, on the 16th of October he breathed his last, with the utmost piety and resignation. Leicester did not remain long after this in Holland. On his return to the Hague, he was assailed with complaints by the States for his conduct. He gave them fair words, and then, on the 3d of December, sailed for England, where the case of the Queen of Scots now called for his presence.

While Leicester was thus ingloriously engaged in the Netherlands, Drake, who had been sent to attack the Spaniards in the West Indies, had very different success. He took St. Domingo, Carthagena, and

some other towns, and returned with booty valued at £60,000 (\$288,000), and 240 pieces of cannon.

A league, offensive and defensive, was formed this year, 1586, between Elizabeth and the King of Scots, for the defence of their dominions and religion against the Catholic powers. The queen was to grant James a pension of £5000 (\$24,000) a year, equivalent to his claim on the English property of his paternal grandmother, lately deceased.

In the summer of this year a conspiracy against the queen of the most dangerous character was detected by the sagacity of Walsingham. Some priests at Rheims, actuated by a fanatical hatred of Elizabeth, and regarding the deposing bull of Pius V. as suggested by the Holy Ghost, had worked themselves into a belief that her assassination would be a meritorious act in the sight of God. Three of these men, Dr. Gifford, his brother Gilbert, and one Hodgeson, instigated a man named John Savage, who had served in the Spanish army, to undertake the deed; instructed him how to effect it, and sent him over, with strong recommendations, to the English Catholics. About this time, also, one Ballard, a Seminary-priest, came from England to Paris; and stating there to the enemies of Elizabeth the readiness of their English friends to rise in case an invasion were made (for which the present was the most favourable time, since the best troops were away with Leicester in Holland), a plan for that purpose was devised, and Ballard was sent back to prepare the Catholics to support it. It does not appear that the assassination of the queen had been determined on, though Charles Paget gave his opinion that there was no use in invading England if she were permitted to live.

Ballard came over in the disguise of a soldier, calling himself Captain Fortescue. He disclosed the project to Anthony Babington, a young man of good fortune in Derbyshire, who had been recommended to Mary by Morgan and the Bishop of Glasgow, and had been for some time the agent in conveying letters between her and them. Babington at once ap-

proved of the plan: but, like Paget, maintained that there was no chance of success while the queen lived. Ballard then told him of Savage: but he objected to committing a matter of so great importance to the hands of a single person, and proposed to join with him five others, for whose courage and fidelity he could answer. Ballard agreed; and Babington then opened his views to some Catholic gentlemen, his intimate friends, who readily consented to join in them.\* The correspondence was renewed between Babington and Mary, who expressed her perfect approbation of the plan in all its parts. She was now at Chartley, in Staffordshire, under the charge of Sir Amias Paulet, a rigid Puritan, and a man of strict honour.

The conspirators were, in general, vain, thoughtless young men, as is proved by their folly in causing a painting to be made of the six who were to murder the queen, with Babington in the midst of them: for, fully relying on each other's honour, they deemed themselves secure from discovery. But all their proceedings were well known to Walsingham. A priest named Maud, who had accompanied Ballard to France, was in his pay; as was also Polly, one of Babington's confederates. Finally, when Gilbert Gifford was sent over to England to urge on Savage, he privately tendered his services to Walsingham. As Gifford was to be the medium for communicating with the Queen of Scots, Walsingham wished Paulet to connive at his bribing one of his servants: but to this the scrupulous Puritan would not consent. He, however, suffered a brewer's boy, who served the house with beer, to be the agent;† and the letters were conveyed through a

\* They were Edw. Windsor, T. Salisbury, Ch. Tilney, Chidicock Tichbourne, Edw. Abington, Robt. Gage, J. Charnock, J. Travers, J. Jones, H. Dunn, and Barnwell, an Irish gentleman. Of these, Tilney, Tichbourne, Abington, Barnwell, and Charnock were appointed with Savage to murder the queen. Tilney and Tichbourne at first refused: but their scruples were overcome by Ballard and Babington. Salisbury could not be induced to attempt her life.

† Camden. Lingard (viii., 204) calls him a "townsman of Bur-

H 2

hole in a wall, which was stopped with a loose stone. Ballard and Babington having some doubts of Gifford, gave him at first only blank letters: but, finding that these went safe, they dropped all suspicions. The whole correspondence thus passed through the hands of Walsingham; all the letters were deciphered and copied, and thus the entire plot and the names of the actors were discovered. Walsingham communicated what he had learned to no one except the queen.

Babington wished to send Ballard abroad to press the foreign invasion, and had procured a license for him under a feigned name. He also intended to go himself for the same purpose, and applied to Walsingham, affecting great zeal for the queen's cause. The minister kept him in hand, and even induced him to come and reside in the mean while at his own house. Walsingham wished to carry on this secret mode of proceeding still longer: but the queen said that, by not preventing the danger in time, she "should seem rather to tempt God than to trust in God." Ballard was accordingly arrested. Babington was now desirous that no time should be lost in killing the queen; and he gave his ring and some money to Savage, whose appearance was extremely shabby, that he might buy himself good clothes for the purpose. Finding, soon after, that the plot was known or suspected, the conspirators stole out of London, and lurked for some days in St. John's Wood, and other places about the city; but they were taken in a short time and put into prison, where they voluntarily made very ample confessions. They were tried, and sentenced to be executed as traitors. On the 20th of September, Ballard, Babington, Savage, and four others were hung in St. Giles's Fields. After the ancient barbarous manner, they were cut down while still alive, and their bowels taken out before their faces: but the queen, when she heard of this cruelty, gave strict orders that the remainder should not be embowelled or quartered till they were dead.

ton, known among the parties by the nickname of 'the honest man.' "

When the conspirators were arrested, Sir Thomas Gorges was sent from court with the tidings to the Queen of Scots. She was on her horse, prepared to go out a hunting when he arrived. She desired to return to her chamber, but was not permitted. Soon after she was brought back to Chartley, and was then conducted from one gentleman's house to another till the 26th of September, when she reached Fotheringay Castle, in Northamptonshire. During her first absence from Chartley, her two secretaries, Nau, a Frenchman, and Curle, a Scot, were arrested and sent up to London. Her cabinets were at the same time broken open, and her extensive correspondence, both in England and on the Continent, was discovered and seized.

Abundant evidence having been now procured against the Queen of Scots, the question with the council was how she should be treated. Some were for keeping her in strict confinement, as it was believed she could not live long, her health being in a declining state. But Burleigh and Walsingham knew that, so long as she lived, she would never cease to plot the ruin of the queen and of the Protestant religion; and self-preservation also was not without its influence: for if she should succeed to the throne, their lives, they were aware, would pay the forfeit of their loyalty to their queen. Leicester, who was in Holland, suggested the employment of poison, and sent a divine to Walsingham to justify this course: but that upright statesman rejected it, protesting against all violence except by sentence of law. It was finally resolved to bring her to trial under the late act; and a commission of forty noblemen, privy counsellors, and judges, of both religious parties, was appointed to examine and judge her case.

On the 11th of October the commissioners came to Fotheringay. The next morning they sent to Mary a letter from the queen, charging her with being accessory to the late conspiracy, and informing her of the commission appointed to try her. She read the letter calmly, denied the charges, and declared that,

being an absolute [independent] queen, she would not derogate from her rank by submitting to such a trial. The following day, Lord Burleigh, the chancellor, and some others waited on her, and they urged her "with fair words" to submit; at the same time assuring her that her refusal would not prevent them from proceeding. She still, however, persisted: but Hatton's speech, in which he observed that if she were innocent, as she asserted, she wronged her reputation by refusing a trial before honourable, upright men, had some effect on her. She offered to answer before the parliament, or the queen in council, provided she were acknowledged next in succession. She at the same time declared that she would never submit to the law named in the commission. Burleigh told her they would nevertheless proceed in the cause the next day. "Examine your consciences," said she; "be tender of your honour: God reward you and yours according to your judgment upon me."

The next morning, the 14th, she sent for some of the commissioners, and said that, having well weighed Hatton's reasons, she was willing to appear, provided her protest was received. They assented, and the court was organized. At one end of the room was placed under a canopy a chair of state for the Queen of England; opposite, at some distance, stood a chair for the Queen of Scots; the commissioners sat on benches on each side, and the law officers at a table in the centre.

The queen having taken her seat, the chancellor addressed her; she then renewed her protest; he replied; and the protest and reply were both recorded. The case was then opened by Sergeant Gaudy, accusing her of participation in Babington's conspiracy. She denied all knowledge both of him and of Ballard. Babington's letters to her were then read; she challenged them to prove that she had received them; parts also of his confession were read, stating the substance of the letters which he declared he had received from her. Mention occurring in these of Arundel and his brothers, she burst into tears, exclaiming,

"Alas ! what hath that noble house of the Howards suffered for my sake !" She then said that, whatever Babington might have confessed, it was all false that she had thus written to him. Finally, a letter of her own to Babington was produced, in which she commended and approved of his plot. She demanded a copy of it, asserted that it was a forgery, and hinted at Walsingham as the forger. The secretary rose and defended himself from the aspersion, and the queen apologized.

In the afternoon the trial was resumed. A copy of a letter to her from Charles Paget, concerning an invasion of England, was read. She did not deny having received it. She was then pressed with the testimonies of her secretaries. Curle, she said, was an honest man, but he was too pliant to Nau, of whom she did not think so well ; they might have inserted things in her letters without her knowledge, and have received letters which they concealed from her. Burleigh then charged her with the design of having her son carried to Spain, and of conveying her claims to Philip. This likewise she did not deny. The substance of her letters to Englefield, Paget, and Mendoza, about an invasion in her favour, was then read ; she declared she thought herself justified in so doing, but disclaimed an intention of injuring the queen's life. The court was then adjourned.

The next day, the 16th, she renewed, as before, her protest, which was recorded. Her letters to Paget were again read, in which she recommended the invasion of England, and spoke of placing herself on the throne ; and one from Allen, in which he addressed her as his sovereign. She again denied all knowledge of Babington's plot, and asserted that he and her secretaries had accused her to save themselves. She finally demanded to be heard in a full parliament, or by the queen in council ; and therefore rose, and conferred apart with Burleigh, Hatton, Walsingham, and Lord Warwick, when the court was adjourned to the 25th, to be held in the Star Chamber at Westminster.

It is impossible to read the full account of this re-



markable trial, without admiring the ability with which Mary sustained the contest against overwhelming evidence and the ablest men in England. Her great anxiety seems to have been, to clear herself from participation in the plot for assassinating Elizabeth; but there was nothing more than her simple denial against the confessions of Babington and her secretaries, and the testimony of her own letter; and, unless we suppose that these men uttered needless falsehoods, and that Walsingham, one of the most honourable of statesmen, committed forgery for the sake of destroying her, we cannot give credit to her assertions of innocence.\*

On the 25th the commissioners met again; and the secretaries Nau and Curle attested, on oath, the truth and reality of the letters and copies which had been produced. The Queen of Scots was then pronounced guilty of all that had been laid to her charge:† at the same time, a public declaration was made, "that the said sentence did nothing derogate from James, king of Scotland, in his title and honour." Parliament met

\* The following passages occur in her letter to Babington: "The affairs being thus prepared, and forces in readiness both within and without the realm, then shall it be time to set the six gentlemen on work." "Taking good order upon the accomplishment of their discharges, I may be suddenly transported out of this place." "Now for that there can be no certain day appointed for the accomplishment of the said gentlemen's designment . . . . I would that they had . . . scout men . . . with good and speedy horses so soon as the design shall be executed to come to advise me thereof."

† Whether the Queen of Scots were actually guilty of all that was alleged against her or not, it is pretty evident, we think, from the character of all the proceedings before and during her trial, that it was determined to make her so. The following is the judgment of a writer whose opinions are the more valuable from the moderation and candour with which they are uniformly expressed. "It is clear that the Queen of Scots was aware, not only of the projected invasion and rebellion, but of the design against the life of Queen Elizabeth; but it is extremely doubtful whether she had that identical participation for which she was condemned. There are few judiciary proceedings, passing over the question of jurisdiction, so suspicious, and, it may be said, so tainted as the case and proceedings against the Queen of Scots."—Mackintosh's *History of England*, iii., 283, Harpers' edition.—*Am. Ed.*

shortly after, on the 29th, when they approved and confirmed the sentence against the Queen of Scots, and petitioned Elizabeth to have it executed. She replied in most gracious terms,\* and promised to come to a speedy resolution. A few days after she sent, advising them to consider the matter anew, and see if some way might not be found for preserving the Queen of Scots' life without hazarding her own security. Both houses resolved "that there could be found no other sound and assured means." The queen's reply was somewhat ambiguous. The sentence, however, was published; the citizens forthwith illuminated their houses; the bells of the churches rang out joyful peals, and similar manifestations of the popular feeling were exhibited all over the kingdom.

When this was notified to Mary, and it was added that, while she lived, the religion of England could not be secure, she gave God thanks, claiming to be regarded as a martyr for the cause of the true church. Paulet now took down her canopy of state, and treated her no longer with the respect due to a royal personage. She wrote to Elizabeth on the 19th of December, making three requests, viz., that her remains might be sent to France for interment; that she might not be put to death privately, but in view of her servants and others, who might bear testimony to her faith in Christ and her obedience to the church; and that her servants might be permitted to depart, and to retain the legacies she should leave them. To this letter, which was written in a strain so pious and dignified that it drew tears from the eyes of Elizabeth, she received no answer.

The King of France sent a special ambassador, Bellièvre, to intercede for Mary: but the queen set at naught his menaces, and fully replied to his arguments. It is said, indeed (but perhaps without sufficient warrant), that Bellièvre had secret instructions

\* "A prostitute court phrase," as it has been well called by an acute writer, "not yet become obsolete."—*Am. Ed.*

to urge the execution of Mary. King James also sent Sir William Keith to remonstrate with the queen; and he wrote to her, with his own hand, in very strong terms. He afterward despatched Sir Robert Melville and the Master of Gray for the same purpose: but the securities they offered for the queen's safety did not appear sufficient, and Elizabeth despised the menaces of the Scottish king. Gray, it is said, secretly advised her to carry the sentence into effect, saying, *Mortua non mordet* (Dead she will not bite). James then ordered prayers to be put up in the churches for his mother, "that it might please God to illuminate her with the light of his truth, and save her from the apparent danger with which she was threatened." Yet even this cautious form was rejected, and none but the royal chaplains prayed for the captive queen. This alone we might consider quite sufficient to answer those who blame James for not taking up arms in the cause of his mother.

The pride of Elizabeth made her assume a determined tone towards the French and Scottish ambassadors;\* but she was, in reality, quite undecided.† Her natural aversion to bloodshed, her respect for the kindred and royal blood of Mary, her apprehension of the Catholic powers, and her fear of the judgment which posterity might pass on the deed, caused her

\* "And I spake," writes the master to James, "craving of her that her life may be spared for fifteen days; she refused. Sir Robert craved for only eight days; she said, 'Not for an hour,' and so geid her away." "She answered in the tone of a lioness who has grasped her prey, 'No, not an hour!'" says Sir Walter Scott. It is thus that history gains circumstances in its progress.

† So far was she from being "undecided," that, according to other historians, when Melville implored her to delay the execution for a short time, she turned quickly away from him and angrily replied, "*No, not an hour!*" which, if it be true, affords little evidence of an "aversion to bloodshed," or that she was much troubled with any promptings of humanity, or compunctious visitings of conscience. Whatever may be our opinions in regard to Mary, there is surely nothing in the conduct of the English queen, throughout the whole of her proceedings in this affair, which is calculated to make us think very favourably either of her principles or feelings.—*Am. Ed.*

to hesitate. On the other hand, those who were about her incessantly reminded her of the dangers with which she would be environed so long as Mary lived; a conspiracy to murder her, in which the French resident Aubespine, a creature of the Guises, was said to be concerned, had been detected or invented; various rumours of the landing of foreign armies in England, and of plots to set London on fire, and to kill the queen, were spread; and the whole nation seemed to clamour for the execution of the Queen of Scots. Elizabeth became pensive and solitary, and she was frequently heard to sigh, and to mutter to herself these words, *Aut fer aut feri* ('Bear or strike'), and *Ne feriare feri* ('Strike lest you be struck').\*

The warrant, in the mean time, had been drawn out by Burleigh, and on the 1st of February, 1587, the queen, who was then at Richmond, sent Howard, the lord admiral, with directions to the Secretary Davison to bring it to her.† She signed it, and asked him if he was not heartily sorry to see it done. He replied in terms which pleased her, and she then directed him to take it to the chancellor and have it sealed, and to send it down to the commissioners without delay, and not to trouble her any farther on the subject, as she had now done all that could be expected of her. She also directed him to call as he went on Walsingham, who was ill, as "the grief he would feel on learning it would," she merrily added, "nearly kill him out-

\* "Elizabeth, as the time approached for executing the sentence, affected, and only affected, to feel a conflict of passions within her bosom. She mused, and raved, and muttered to herself, *Aut fer aut feri: ne feriare feri*; and only indulged her imagination in the display of mimic agonies. Her ministers reiterated their cry for blood, and she pleaded her humanity; but then she added that she must, with whatever pain, consult the safety of religion, the state, and the people." Such is the picture drawn by one of the most discriminating and ingenuous of historians, and it is to be feared that it is but too true in every particular.—*Am. Ed.*

† The succeeding narrative rests on the evidence of Davison, and of the truth of which there can be no reasonable doubt.

VOL. III.—I

right." She then complained of Paulet and Drury,\* who, she said, might have eased her of this burden; and desired him and Walsingham to write, for the purpose of sounding them.

Davison showed the warrant to Burleigh and Leicester, and, at their request, went to London without delay. Having seen Walsingham and arranged with him about the letter they were to write, he proceeded to the chancellor and got the warrant sealed. On his return to Walsingham, he found the letter to the two knights ready. It hinted to them the queen's wish that they should put their prisoner secretly to death. They signed it and sent it off that evening. In the morning W. Killebrew came to Davison from the queen, to say that, if he had not been already with the chancellor, he should not go till he had seen her again. Davison forthwith repaired to Richmond; and, when the queen found that the warrant was sealed, she said, "What needeth that haste?" He replied, that he had only done what he conceived to be his duty. He then asked her if she continued in her purpose: she said she did, "albeit she thought it might have been better handled, because this course threw the whole burden on herself." After some farther discourse to the same effect, she went to dinner. Davison then consulted with Hatton; they both went to Burleigh, who approved of Davison's intention not to proceed singly in the business; and it was agreed that the case should be laid before the whole council in the morning. Burleigh undertook to write the necessary letters, and Davison gave him the warrant.

The next day, the 3d, the council met. They resolved to take the responsibility on themselves, and send off the warrant at once; and in the afternoon they met again, signed the requisite letters to the earls of Shrewsbury and Kent, and despatched Beale, the clerk of the council, with them. Next morning, the 4th, Davison waited on the queen. She told him,

\*Sir Drue Drury had been lately joined in commission with Sir Amisa Paulet.

with a smile, that she had dreamed that the queen of Scots was executed, and that she had been greatly incensed with him for it. He said it was well he had not been near her when she was in that humour. He then seriously asked her if she did not intend to go through with it. She said yes, with a solemn oath, but added that "she thought it might have received a better form." Davison expressed his dislike of the course she hinted at; when she told him that wiser men than he were of a different opinion, and that it had been suggested to her by "one in great place" (evidently meaning Leicester). She asked him if he had heard yet from Paulet: he replied in the negative. On his return to London, however (the same day), he received a letter from him and Drury, containing a flat refusal "to shed blood without law or warrant." When he reported this to the queen on the 6th, she complained of the "niceness of those precise fellows," adding that she could have done very well without them, as one Wingfield and others would have undertaken it. When Davison next saw her, on the 7th, "she entered of herself," he says, "into some earnest discourse of the danger she lived in, and how it was more than time this matter were despatched, swearing with a great oath that it was a shame for us all that it was not already done, considering that she had, for her part, done all that law or reason could require of her, and therefore made some mention to have letters written to Sir Amias Paulet for the hastening thereof, because the longer it was deferred the more her danger increased." Davison replied that he thought there was no need, the warrant being "so general and sufficient;" she said, "she thought Sir Amias Paulet would look for it," and so broke off the discourse, and Davison saw her no more.\*

\* It would appear, from the preceding, that Elizabeth's "aversion to blood" was altogether of a political character. From motives of policy, she hesitated to kill her prisoner by regular course of law and under her own warrant, in the hope that some compliant friend might be induced to relieve her of so unpleasant a duty. To the honour of that age, and what we should have

That very day, the two earls, with the sheriff of the county, came to Fotheringay. They forthwith waited on the unhappy prisoner, and bade her prepare for death in the morning. She received the annunciation with the utmost composure, and requested that her almoner might be allowed to visit and prepare her for her end. This, being a thing unheard of, was refused;\* but the services of the bishop or dean of Peterborough were proffered, which she of course declined. The Earl of Kent in his zeal said, "Your life will be the death of our religion, as your death will be the life of it;" words of which she artfully took advantage to make out that it was solely for her religion that she suffered. Again she denied all knowledge of Babington's conspiracy.

When the earls were gone she ordered supper to be prepared. She partook of it sparingly, as usual, and endeavoured to comfort her servants, who could not restrain their tears. She drank to them, and they, in return, pledged her on their knees; they then craved her pardon for any neglect of duty, and she craved theirs if in any case she had been harsh or unkind to them. She then looked over her will and the inventory of her goods, and wrote some letters. After which she went to bed at her usual time, slept for some hours, and then rose and spent the remainder of the night in prayer.

On the morning of the 8th, the queen arrayed herself in her richest clothes. The sheriff, at about eight o'clock, entered her chapel, where she and her servants were at prayers, to summon her. She rose, took her crucifix in one hand, and her prayer-book in the other. She then gave her blessing to her servants, who were not allowed to follow her. The door was closed: on coming out she was joined by

scarcely expected, such a friend was not to be found; and the crafty queen was compelled to assume the responsibility and guilt openly to herself.—*Am. Ed.*

\* They surely might have allowed her this poor charity; and the remark of our author, that it was "a thing unheard of," sounds strangely in this more humane and enlightened age.—*Am. Ed.*

the earls and her keepers, and descended the staircase. At the foot, Melvill, her steward, met her; and, bursting into tears, lamented that he should be the bearer of such sorrowful tidings to Scotland. She bade him rejoice rather than lament, as the end of her troubles had arrived; and to report that she died true to her religion, to Scotland, and to France. "He that is the true judge of all secret thoughts," she added, "knoweth my mind, how that ever it hath been my desire to have Scotland and England united together. Commend me to my son, and tell him that I have not done anything that may prejudice his kingdom of Scotland. And so, good Melvill, farewell!" She kissed him, and bade him pray for her. The Earl of Kent reluctantly assented to her request, that two of her maids and four of her men might attend her. The procession then entered the hall, Melvill bearing the queen's train. The hall was filled with spectators, and there stood in it a scaffold two feet high, covered with black. Paulet aided her to ascend it. She seated herself on a stool; the warrant was read, and thereupon she asserted again the injustice of her sentence, and denied all intention of injuring the queen. The Dean of Peterborough then commenced a most ill-timed and even cruel address to her. She desired him not to trouble himself, as she was determined to die in the faith in which she had been brought up. The earls then directed him to pray, and the spectators joined in the devotions: but Mary, holding out the crucifix, prayed in Latin with her servants, out of the office of the Virgin. "Madam," said the Earl of Kent, "settle Jesus Christ in your heart, and leave those trumperies." She took no heed, but continued her prayers. Her women then began to take off her garments; the executioners came forward to assist: she told them she was not used to employ such grooms, or to strip before so numerous an assembly. When she was disrobed, her women began to lament aloud. She reminded them of her promise, and crossed and kissed them, bidding them to rejoice and not weep, as they would



now see the end of all her troubles. Then she crossed her men-servants also, bidding them farewell. She sat down again, and one of her maids fastened a Corpus Christi cloth over her face. She was now led to the block, and knelt down, saying several times, "Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit." Her head was severed at the second stroke, and the executioner held it up, streaming with blood. "So perish all the queen's enemies!" cried the dean. "Such end of all the queen's and the Gospel's enemies!" said the Earl of Kent, standing over the body. All the rest were silent, from pity or from horror.\*

Such was the end of the unfortunate Mary Stuart. Her conduct in the closing scene of her life was calm, devout, and dignified: yet, when we reflect on the crimes of which she must have been conscious, we could wish that she had shown more of the penitent and less of the martyr on this awful occasion. The mind of Mary, however, had probably been so perverted, that she looked on the murder of her husband as laudable revenge, and thought herself justified by natural law and religion in conspiring against the life of Elizabeth, as being at once her political antagonist and a heretic.

At the time of her execution, Mary was in the forty-sixth year of her age. She had long suffered from rheumatism, and had lost the beauty for which she is celebrated. She is described by an eyewitness as "being of stature tall, of body corpulent, round-shouldered, her face fat and broad, double-chinned, with hazel eyes and borrowed hair." Her own hair is said to have been "as gray as one of threescore and ten years old."

Whatever the wishes or suspicions of Elizabeth

\* "Thus died," says Mackintosh, "Mary queen of Scots, in the nineteenth year of her captivity, and forty-fifth of her age, having redeemed, by the wrongs and sufferings of her life, and the heroism of her death, her frailties, and, if she committed it, her single crime." For a more favourable view of the character of the Scottish queen, see Mackintosh's *History of England*, and Bell's *Life of her* in Harpers' Family Library.—*Am. Ed.*

may have been, there seem to be no grounds for supposing that she actually knew of the warrant having been sent. According to Davison, when the intelligence of the execution arrived, on the evening of the 8th, Burleigh and the other councillors thought it best not to tell her at once. She heard it, however, he says, from some other quarter, and testified neither feeling nor displeasure. But in the morning, when the event was officially announced to her, she showed every symptom of grief and indignation. She shed tears; her voice was broken by sighs; she drove her councillors from her presence with reproaches, and put herself and her whole court in mourning. Davison was committed to the Tower, and then brought before the Star Chamber, where he was sentenced to pay a fine of 10,000 marks (£32,000), and to be imprisoned during pleasure, for contempt of the queen's majesty, breach of his allegiance, and neglect of duty in acquainting the council with the warrant, and having it executed without her knowledge. The fine, which reduced him to beggary, was rigorously exacted, and the queen would never restore him to favour. Leicester and Hatton felt her displeasure also; and even Burleigh was treated with such harshness, that he craved permission to resign his offices and retire. It was only after making the humblest submissions that he succeeded in mollifying his incensed sovereign.

Though we may not regard the conduct of Elizabeth throughout this unhappy affair as being that vile tissue of hypocrisy it is generally esteemed, there certainly was in it much which we cannot but condemn. It would have been, no doubt, the more generous course, though perhaps not the safer, to have spared Mary's life: yet we cannot deem it unjust to punish her capitally, when she conspired against the life of a princess to whose throne she never ceased to lay claim.\* But Elizabeth should have proceeded

\* See Hallam. It has been observed, that the detention of Napoleon in 1815 is a case nearly parallel to that of Mary. Had

openly ; she should not have thought of imitating the examples of private execution given by her ancestors ; nor have attempted to shift the responsibility which belonged to herself upon others. She certainly deceived Davison to his ruin, and would have ruined Paulet and Drury also but for their own sense of religion and honour. Her memory has consequently paid the penalty, and the execution of the Queen of Scots, with all her crimes, remains an indelible stain on the fame of Elizabeth.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### ELIZABETH (CONTINUED).

1587-1603.

Conduct of the Kings of Scotland and France.—Philip prepares to invade England.—Preparations for Defence.—The Invincible Armada.—Death and Character of Leicester.—Affairs of France.—Naval Enterprises.—Taking of Cadiz.—State of Ireland.—Essex sent thither.—His Return, Insurrection, and Death.—The Queen's last Illness and Death.—Her Character.—Measures of her Reign.

THE King of Scots, when he heard of the execution of his mother, naturally expressed great indignation, and his language breathed revenge. But Elizabeth wrote to him with her own hand, exculpating herself. Leicester also wrote to him, and Walsingham to his secretary, Maitland, pointing out the folly and hazard of violent measures ; and James at length allowed himself to be convinced and pacified. Nor is this any matter of surprise. He could have had but little affection for a mother whom he had

he been kept in England, and there engaged in conspiracies against the life of the king, he also might, perhaps, have been executed.

never known, and who, in her bigotry, had proposed to give him as an hostage to the pope or the King of Spain, and in her will had disinherited him in favour of the latter, unless he should renounce his religion and become a Catholic. He also well knew that his people would not support him in a war with Elizabeth, and that he might thereby lose all chance of the crown of England. The King of France beheld with secret satisfaction this diminution of the power of the house of Guise, and thus Philip of Spain was the only prince who, under the pretence of avenging Mary, might turn his arms against Elizabeth.

The queen having ascertained that Philip was preparing a fleet for the invasion of England, sent out Drake to endeavour to destroy his shipping. He entered the port of Cadiz, where he burned one hundred vessels laden with stores and ammunition; thence he sailed to Cape St. Vincent, and took the castle and three other fortresses; and then proceeding to the Azores, he lay in wait for and captured the *St. Philip*, a richly-laden carrack.\* These losses caused the intended invasion to be deferred for a year; while the successes which they had obtained inspired the English seamen with contempt for the Spaniards and their huge, unwieldy ships. In Holland affairs were less favourable. Sir William Stanley, a Romanist, to whom Leicester had intrusted the defence of Deventer, with a garrison of twelve hundred English, betrayed it to the Spaniards, and he and his men entered their service. His example was followed by an officer named York, who commanded a fort near Zutphen. Leicester himself, on his return, failed in an attempt to relieve Sluys; the ill-feeling between him and the States increased daily; suspecting him of a design on their liberties, they slighted his authority

\* The carrack was a large trading-vessel of heavy, clumsy construction, employed by the Spaniards in distant voyages, and principally to their newly-acquired possessions in America; and to which the name of galleon was subsequently given. They were finally built so large as to have four and even five decks, and were armed for defence, and used in war.—*Am. Ed.*

and thwarted his plans, while he was intolerably imperious and violent. At length the queen deemed it advisable to remove him from a situation for which he was manifestly unfit. The States elected Maurice, son of the late Prince of Orange, governor in his stead; and the command of the English troops was given to Lord Willoughby.

This year the office of chancellor becoming vacant, the queen raised to that high dignity Sir Christopher Hatton, the vice-chamberlain. The lawyers sneered at the appointment, but the court of chancery was not then what it has become since. Hatton had good sense and honesty, and, with the aid of two sergeants-at-law, he discharged the duties of his office in such a manner as gave general satisfaction.

Though there had been no actual declaration of war between Spain and England, each party had for many years been injuring the other. Elizabeth had aided the Dutch, and countenanced the expeditions of Drake and other adventurers; while Philip had excited rebellion in Ireland, promoted conspiracies against the life and authority of Elizabeth in England, and was even preparing to invade it in favour of the Queen of Scots. After the death of that princess, he resolved to put forth for himself a claim to the crown, as the descendant of John of Gaunt; and Pope Sixtus V., at his desire, renewed the bull of his predecessor, Pius V., and raised Allen to the dignity of cardinal, that, like Pole, he might proceed as legate to England when it should be conquered. The new cardinal forthwith published an "Admonition," addressed to the nobility of England, full of the grossest falsehoods and the vilest calumnies concerning the queen, and composed in the vituperative style then familiar to the Romish writers. The wealth of the Indies was devoted by Philip to the building of ships and the purchase of stores; and, in the spring of 1588, a fleet of one hundred and thirty-five ships of war, galleys, galleasses, and galleons,\* from the different

\* The *galley* was a vessel impelled with oars; it carried can-

ports of his Spanish and Italian dominions, rendezvoused in the Tagus. The Prince of Parma, in the mean time, had ships and boats built in the ports of the Netherlands, for transporting a veteran force of thirty thousand men to the coast of England. It had been the advice of this able officer, that Flushing should be first reduced, to assure the fleet of a retreat in case of accident: but Philip would hear of no delay.

While these immense preparations for her overthrow were going on, the Prince of Parma was amusing Elizabeth with a negotiation for terminating all differences. But the means of resistance were, in the mean time, not neglected. All the men from sixteen to sixty were enrolled and trained by the lords-lieutenant of counties, who were directed to appoint officers and provide arms; one army of thirty-six thousand men, under Lord Huntsdon, was to be assembled for the guard of the royal person; another of thirty thousand, under Leicester, was to be stationed at Tilbury, to protect the city. The seaports were required to supply shipping according to their means. On this occasion the city of London set a noble example. Being called upon to furnish five thousand men and fifteen ships, the citizens voluntarily pledged themselves to send double the number of each. The royal navy consisted of but thirty-four ships: but many noblemen fitted out vessels at their own expense, so that the entire fleet numbered one hundred and eighty-one ships of all kinds, manned by 17,472 seamen. The chief command was intrusted to Howard of Effingham, lord-high-admiral of England; and the three distinguished seamen, Drake, Hawkins, and Frobisher, held commands under him. The main fleet was stationed at Plymouth; while a squadron of forty ships, under Lord Henry Seymour, lay off Dunkirk, to watch the motions of the Prince of Parma.

The Protestants of Europe naturally regarded with

non on the poop and stern: the *gallesse* was a larger galley, with cannon also between the oars; the *galleon* was a large ship of war, with cannon on the sides, poop, and stern. See Lingard, viii., 272.

intense interest the approach of a contest which was probably to decide the fate of their religion: but the Dutch alone came forward to aid the queen in her struggle. The King of Scotland, though his interests were nearly as much involved in the conflict as those of Elizabeth, kept back till he had extorted most advantageous terms from Ashby, the English resident.\* The King of France himself was little inclined to aid the ambitious projects of Philip, though cloaked with the pretence of zeal for religion: but the Guises prepared a body of their adherents to join in the invasion. Her own Catholic subjects caused Elizabeth most apprehension:† her council were well aware of their readiness to rise in favour of Mary when she was living, and it was feared that zeal for their religion might even now prove too strong for their national feeling. Some even advised to seize and put the leading Catholics to death; but the queen rejected this expedient with horror, and contented herself with confining a few of the most suspected at Wisbeach, in the fens of Ely. The Catholics, to their honour, justified her confidence in them: their nobles armed their tenantry in her service, while some fitted out vessels at their own expense, giving the command of them to Protestants.

At length, on the 29th of May, the Invincible Armada, as it was proudly styled, sailed from the Tagus. It consisted of 130 ships, carrying 19,000 soldiers, 8000 seamen, 2000 galley slaves, and 2630 pieces of cannon: its commander was the Duke of Medina Sidonia, aided by Juan de Recalde, a distinguished seaman. It carried also a corps of one hundred and eighty monks and friars of the different orders, for the conversion of the heretics, and a supply of arms for

\* He made the treaty on the 4th of August. The danger was then over, though he could not have known it.

† Dr. Lingard says the Catholics were one half of the population; Allen had said two thirds. Cardinal Bentivoglio considered the real Catholics to be but a thirtieth. (Hallam, i., 239.) Those who, like Lingard, exaggerate the number of the Catholics, ought to perceive that they thus, in a great measure, justify the severities of the government towards them.

the disaffected Catholics. Off the coast of Galicia it experienced a tempest, which obliged the admiral to remain for some time at Corunna to refit. When the news of this reached England, the queen, thinking the danger over for the year, sent word to the admiral to lay up the four largest ships: but he wrote, requesting to be allowed to keep them, even at his own expense. He sailed towards Spain: but, finding the wind changed to the south, he returned with all speed to Plymouth, lest the enemy should arrive before him. On the 12th of July the armada again put to sea, and on the 19th it arrived off the Lizard point, in Cornwall, where it was seen by Flemming, a Scottish pirate, who hastened to Plymouth with the tidings. The English admiral got his fleet out to sea, though with great difficulty, as the wind blew strong into the port.

The instructions of the Spanish admiral were to avoid hostilities till he had seen the army of the Prince of Parma safely landed in England: he therefore rejected the advice of his captains to attack the English; and the armada proceeded up channel in the form of a crescent, of which the two extremes were seven miles asunder. The motion of this immense fleet, the greatest that had ever then ploughed the ocean, was slow, though every sail was spread: "the winds," says Camden, "being as it were tired with carrying them, and the ocean groaning under their weight." The plan adopted by the English admiral was to follow the armada, constantly harass it, and cut off the straggling ships. During the six days which it took the Spaniards to reach Calais, the annoyance was incessant, and several of their ships were either taken or disabled: the more skilful seamanship of the English, and the superior sailing and better construction of their ships, giving them great advantage over the unwieldy galleons and galleasses. At length, on the 27th, the armada cast anchor near Calais; and the admiral sent off to the Prince of Parma, requiring him to embark his troops without delay. But this it was not in his power to do, inasmuch as



his stores were not yet prepared, his sailors had deserted, and the Dutch, farthermore, blockaded the harbours of Dunkirk and Newport. The armada itself narrowly escaped destruction; for, on the night of the 29th, the English sent eight fireships into the midst of it. The Spaniards in terror cut their cables; in the morning, when they were dispersed, the English fell on them and took two galleons; and the following day, the 31st, a storm coming on, drove them among the shoals and sands of Zeeland. Here, in a council of war, it was decided, as the fleet was now in too shattered a condition to effect anything, to return to Spain without delay. But the passage down the channel was so full of hazard, that it was resolved in preference to sail round Scotland and Ireland, dangerous as that course appeared. The armada now set sail, and the English pursued as far as Flamborough Head; but here want of ammunition compelled them to give over the chase. Storms assailed this unwieldy armament in its progress, and several ships were cast away on the west and south coast of Ireland, and their crews butchered by the natives, or put to the sword by orders of the lord-deputy. The total loss of the Spaniards was thirty large ships and about ten thousand men. Philip received the intelligence of these disasters with great equanimity, ordering public thanks to God and the saints that the calamity was no greater, and sending money to be distributed among the surviving crews.

The Queen of England had shown throughout this impending invasion the spirit of a heroine. On the 9th of August she visited the camp at Tilbury, rode along the lines on a white palfrey, with a truncheon in her hand, and animated the soldiers by her inspiring language. When the danger was over, she went in state to St. Paul's, to return thanks to Heaven. She granted pensions to the disabled seamen, bestowed distinguished favours on the admiral\* and his offi-

\* Some time after she raised him to the dignity of Earl of Nottingham.

cers, and had actually caused a warrant to be prepared appointing Leicester to the office of lord-lieutenant of England and Ireland: but the influence of Burleigh and Walsingham prevented her from signing it. As Leicester was on his way to Kenilworth, after disbanding his army, he fell sick on the road, and died at Cornbury Park, in Oxfordshire, on the 4th of September. The queen, although she lamented him, caused his goods to be seized for payment of his debts to the crown.

There is no character in history more enigmatical than that of Leicester. On the one hand, we find him, for a space of thirty years, retaining the favour of one of the most sagacious and penetrating of princesses, notwithstanding he had enemies enough who were ever ready to reveal to her anything to his disadvantage; and held also in esteem by some of the most virtuous men of the time, and by the rigid sect even of the Puritans. On the other hand, he is portrayed to us as stained with every vice: a hypocrite, a tyrant, an adulterer, a poisoner by wholesale; in short, a monster, unredeemed by a single virtue. This last portrait, however, which cannot be correct, appears in the most suspicious quarter, namely, in a book called "*Leicester's Commonwealth*," written by the Jesuit Persons. The charges there made against him are, in fact, so atrocious as to render them wholly incredible.

Leicester no doubt had great vices, though not without some redeeming qualities. He was a zealous friend, and a faithful observer of his promises; he was also generous, and, as a statesman, sufficiently acute. At the same time, he was insolent, rapacious, and tyrannical, and in his younger days infamously licentious. There is, however, no reason for suspecting the queen of any improper familiarity with him. They had been intimate from childhood; and this circumstance, joined with his personal beauty and mental accomplishments, will perhaps adequately account for her early and continued partiality.\*

\* In 1566 he said to La Forest, the French ambassador, "I re-

A strong desire of taking vengeance on Spain now animated the nation; and the following spring, 1589, Drake and Norris, joined by a number of other gentlemen, obtained the queen's permission to fit out, at their own expense, an armament, the chief object of which was to attempt to place Don Antonio, prior of Crato, on the throne of Portugal. They took and plundered the suburb of Corunna and the shipping in the harbour. Thence they proceeded to Lisbon: but, as the people showed no inclination to rise in favour of Don Antonio, and disease, and want of supplies were beginning to be felt, they put to sea again. On their way home they took and burned the town of Vigo. Though the expedition had been but little more than two months from England, such had been the ravages of sickness, that one half of the troops had perished: out of eleven hundred gentlemen who had embarked, but three hundred and fifty returned.

Among those who took part in this unfortunate expedition was Robert Devereux, earl of Essex, a young nobleman with whom, in chivalrous daring, united with a manly, liberal, and generous spirit, few in that age would compare. He had been recommended to the notice of the queen by his step-father Leicester; and his noble qualities caused him speedily to rise in her estimation, and, after Leicester's death, to occupy the place in her affections so long held by that favourite. Hopeless of obtaining the queen's permission to his exposure of himself to the perils of the expedition, Essex had stolen away from court, embarked secretly, and joined the fleet off the coast of Portugal.

Confusion at this time prevailed more than ever in France. The cowardly, treacherous Henry III. had

ally believe that the queen will never marry. *I have known her since she was eight years of age better than any man in the world.* From that time she has always invariably declared that she would remain unmarried. Should she, however, happen to resolve on marrying, and to choose an Englishman, I am almost convinced that her choice would fall on no other than me; at least the queen has done me the honour several times to tell me so alone, and I am now as high in her favour as ever."—Raumer, Elizabeth and Mary, p. 40.

caused the Duke of Guise and his brother, the cardinal, to be murdered; he himself perished soon after by the dagger of a fanatical monk; and the King of Navarre, being the next heir, assumed the title of Henry IV. But the Romish party, excited by Philip II., refusing to acknowledge an heretical sovereign, set up the Cardinal of Bourbon against him, and the war continued to rage with its wonted animosity. Elizabeth aided Henry with both money and men; and the English troops, led by Sir John Norris, the gallant Earl of Essex, and other brave officers, distinguished themselves on all occasions. Henry, however, after continuing the contest for nearly three years, found that, unless he conformed to the religion of the great majority of his subjects, he had little chance of ultimate success. He therefore, in 1593, declared himself a Catholic, and gradually the whole kingdom submitted to him. Elizabeth, though grieved at this change of faith on the part of the French king, felt it her interest to maintain the alliance she had formed, and her troops aided in the reduction of such places as still held out against him. Against Spain, likewise, the naval warfare was still kept up; and the Earl of Cumberland, Sir Martin Frobisher, and Thomas White, did much injury to the Spanish trade. The English also at this time first made their way to the East Indies. Two vessels, commanded by George Riman and James Lancaster, doubled the Cape of Good Hope. Riman perished off the east coast of Africa, but Lancaster still prosecuted his voyage; and, after enduring many hardships, and losing the greater part of his men, returned to England.

The year 1590 was distinguished by the deaths of the able and disinterested secretary Walsingham; of Thomas Randolph, who had been on thirteen embassies to Scotland, three to Russia, and two to France; of Sir James Crofts, and of the Earl of Shrewsbury, earl-marshal of England. The following year the chancellor Hatton died. The generous Essex endeavoured to procure Walsingham's office for the unfortunate Davison: but the queen's resentment against

him was too strong; and Burleigh, with the view of birnging forward his son, Sir Robert Cecil, took the duties of the office on himself. The great seal was committed to Sergeant Puckering, under the title of lord-keeper.

In 1594, Richard, son of Sir John Hawkins, sailed to the South Sea: but he was made prisoner on the coast of Chili, and sent to Spain. The same year, James Lancaster, having been furnished with three vessels by the merchants of London, captured thirty-nine ships of the enemy, and took and plundered the town of Pernambuco, on the coast of Brazil. The next year, 1595, the able and adventurous Sir Walter Raleigh set forth in search of fortune to America. He had ill-treated one of the maids of honour (to whom, however, he made reparation by marriage), for which offence the queen threw him into prison. She restored him some time after to liberty, but not to favour; and his enterprising spirit, unable to endure inactivity, and thirsting for wealth, urged him to attempt the discovery of those stores of the precious metals, far exceeding all that Peru and Mexico had yielded, which fame reported to be in the region of Guiana, in South America. He sailed from Plymouth on the 6th of February. On his arrival in the West Indies, he took a small town in the isle of Trinidad; and, leaving his ships there, went in his boats for four hundred miles up the river Orinoco. But the city of El Dorado, which was the object of his search, was not to be found; and the fall of the periodical rains prevented his farther progress. On his return to England he published a very interesting narrative of his voyage.\*

At this time, also, Drake, Hawkins, and Sir Thomas Baskerville sailed with twenty-six ships and a body of troops for America. They failed, however, in an attempt on Puerto Rico in the island of Cuba. Soon

\* "Full," says Hume, "of the grossest and most palpable lies." We request the reader to peruse the narrative itself in Cayley's *Life of Raleigh*. He will there see how little Hume's assertions are to be relied on.

after which, Hawkins died, and Drake, having vainly attempted to cross the isthmus to Panama, again put to sea. He died soon after; and Baskerville, having had a smart action with a Spanish fleet off Cuba, returned to England.

Philip had by no means abandoned his designs on England. He even listened seriously to the chimerical project of some English Jesuits and exiles, for placing his daughter, the Infanta of Spain, on the throne of that country, as being the nearest Catholic descendant of John of Gaunt, he himself resigning his pretensions in her favour. His preparations being known, the queen gave her consent to the proposal of Essex, to attack him in his own dominions. A fleet of one hundred and fifty vessels, of various sizes, English and Dutch, carrying fourteen thousand men, of whom fifteen hundred were gentlemen volunteers, commanded by the Lord Admiral Howard, Essex, Sir Thomas Howard, Raleigh, Vere, Carew, and Clifford, sailed from Plymouth on the 1st of June, 1596, and proceeded to Cadiz. On reaching that port, on the 20th, they discovered lying there fifteen men-of-war and forty merchantmen. It was proposed to attack the men-of-war: but the cautious admiral hesitated. At length, however, he gave way: at which Essex was so elated, that, regardless of decorum, he flung his hat up into the air. The action had lasted for six hours, when the enemy attempted to run his ships ashore: but three of them were taken and the same number burned. Essex then landed six hundred men, and advanced against the town, defeating the troops that opposed him, and entering the place along with the fugitives, while the admiral had by this time landed his men, and also forced his way in. No farther resistance was now made; the inhabitants agreed to pay a ransom of 120,000 crowns for their lives, and all the property in the place became the prize of the victors. It was a part of the instructions given by the queen, "that they should spare the women, and those that were very young, or else decrepit, and put none to the sword but such as made opposition." These

instructions were strictly obeyed: and the nuns and other women, to the number of three thousand, were conveyed under an escort to the port of St. Mary, being allowed to take with them their clothes and jewels. A ransom being refused for the merchant vessels, the Duke of Medina Sidonia ordered them to be burned. The entire loss sustained by the King of Spain was estimated at twenty millions of ducats;\* the secret of his domestic weakness was at the same time revealed to the world, while the valour and humanity displayed by the English were spoken of in terms of the highest praise by all men.

The daring Essex wished to retain the town, and endeavour to rouse the Moriscoes† of Andalusia to insurrection: but his more cautious colleagues withheld their consent; and the men, too, were eager to return home with their plunder. The town, therefore, with the exception of the churches, was burned, and the fleet returned to England, having been only ten weeks absent.

Philip, undismayed by his reverses, began to collect a new fleet for the invasion of Ireland; and Elizabeth consented that another expedition against Spain should be fitted out, in which Essex should have the chief command, with Raleigh and Sir T. Howard for his seconds. It consisted of one hundred and forty ships, carrying eight thousand soldiers. This fleet sailed from Plymouth on the 9th of July, 1597: but, being shattered by a tempest, before it could be refitted it was found that the provisions were nearly exhausted. The attack on Spain was therefore deferred for the present, and Essex proceeded to the Azores to intercept the India fleet. He had informed his officers that it was his intention to attack the island of Fayal; and the fleet happening to separate, and Ra-

\* There were two kinds of coin of this name, the one of silver and the other of gold. The value of the former was something more than a Spanish dollar; that of the latter about two dollars and a quarter.—*Am. Ed.*

† The remaining descendants of the Moors, who, at a former period, had ruled over the greater part of Spain.—*Am. Ed.*

leigh and his division arriving there first, he landed and took it. Essex was highly offended, and put Sydney and some other officers under arrest; but, when advised to bring Raleigh to a court-martial, he nobly replied, "I would, had he been one of my friends." He soon, however laid aside his anger, and restored them all to favour. The Spanish fleet, owing, it is said, to Essex's want of seamanship, escaped into port. Three vessels, however, were captured, which sufficed to pay the charges of the expedition. Some time after his return, Essex was raised to the dignity of earl-marshal; and he and Sir Robert Cecil became better friends than they had heretofore been.

In 1599 an opportunity for peace with Spain presented itself. Henry of France, finding tranquillity absolutely requisite for his kingdom, entered into negotiations with Philip for that purpose. It was hoped that a general pacification might be effected: but Philip refusing to treat with the Dutch as a free state, and Elizabeth declining to abandon them, Henry was obliged to conclude a separate peace.

In the English council, the Cecils were for peace, but Essex, on the other hand, was vehement for continuing the war. It is said that in one of the debates, the aged lord-treasurer took a prayer book, and pointed out these words of the Psalmist to Essex: "Men of blood shall not live out half their days," words afterward regarded as prophetic. Soon after, the question of appointing a deputy for Ireland was discussed in presence of the queen. She herself wished to appoint Essex's uncle, Sir William Knolles, while Essex was strenuous in favour of Sir George Carew. In the heat of the argument, he so far forgot himself as to turn his back on the queen in a sort of contempt, at which she gave him a box on the ear; when the enraged earl clapped his hand on his sword, swearing he would not put up with such an affront even from Henry VIII. himself, and abruptly left the court. The coolness which ensued between the queen and her capricious favourite lasted for about five months, at the end of which time he again appeared at court. It



was thought, however, that he never after regained his former place in her favour.

During this temporary disgrace of Essex, the great Lord Burleigh died, at the advanced age of seventy-seven years, leaving a character for prudence, integrity, loyalty, and patriotism rarely attained by statesmen. The queen, attached to him from a deep sense of his virtues and merits, shed many tears at his death; and she could never afterward think of him, or hear his name pronounced, without being affected.

The condition of Ireland now claims our attention. This unhappy country still remained in its pristine barbarism: and the descendants of the English conquerors themselves had sunk nearly to a level with the original natives, while the distinction of race was kept up only as a source of evil. The Reformation even proved, like everything else, a root of bitterness to Ireland. Compulsion, not persuasion, was employed to bring the people to a change of faith; the Irish, and many of the degenerate English, clung the closer for it to their ancient religion, while the courts of the Vatican and Madrid were prompt to take advantage of this feeling. Sanders and others were sent thither to stir up rebellion; and many of the native Irish, by serving in the Spanish armies, had acquired the skill and discipline requisite for opposing the regular troops of England. Throughout the whole reign of Elizabeth, a state of warfare, more or less active, had been kept up in Ireland. Fitzmaurice, earl of Desmond, who ruled in barbaric state over a large portion of Munster, was, in 1583, by the arts of Sanders and others, precipitated into a rebellion, which ended in the ruin of himself and his family, and the confiscation of his immense estates. Hugh O'Nial, whom the queen had raised to the dignity of Earl of Tirone, was now the most formidable opponent of the English government. He had cast off his allegiance, united the northern Irish under himself, and was supplied with arms and ammunition from Spain. Intelligence arrived of his having defeated and slain Sir Henry Bagnal and his force of fifteen hundred men. It was thereupon pro-

posed in the council to send Lord Mountjoy to Ireland as chief governor: but Essex strenuously opposed the appointment; and, in the description which he gave of the kind of person who should be sent, he drew his own portrait so accurately, that it was plain to all what his object was. Cecil, Raleigh, and his other enemies gladly seized on the opportunity thus presented of removing him from court; the new title of lord-lieutenant was forthwith conferred on him; and he left London in March, amid the acclamations of the people, and accompanied by a gallant train of nobles and gentlemen. The forces placed at his disposal amounted to eighteen thousand men.

Instead of marching against Tirone at once, Essex, at the persuasion of some of the Irish council, who wished to secure their estates in Munster, led his forces thither. Here he passed the better part of the summer, and, though the inhabitants made but little resistance, his army gradually melted away by disease and desertion. On his return to Dublin, he was obliged to write to the English council for two thousand additional troops: yet, even when these had arrived, he found that, from desertion and other causes, he could lead but four thousand men against O'Nial. He therefore listened to a proposal of that chief for a conference. They met on the opposite banks of a stream; a truce till the following May was agreed on, and Essex engaged to transmit to England the demands of O'Nial, which were, however, too exorbitant ever to be granted.

Though Essex had received orders not to leave Ireland, he nevertheless resolved to anticipate his enemies, who, he was conscious, had now a fair opportunity of injuring him in the royal mind; and, on the morning of Michaelmas Eve,\* the queen saw him enter her chamber before she had finished dressing, and throw himself on his knees before her. Taken thus by surprise, she gave him her hand to kiss. He

\* The day preceding the festival of St. Michael and All Angels kept on the 29th September.--*Am. Ed.*

retired in high spirits, and was heard to thank God that, though he had met with many storms abroad, he had found a sweet calm at home. Before the day ended, however, the calm turned to a storm: \* the queen, who would not have her authority infringed, ordered him to confine himself to his room, and in a few days committed him to the custody of the lord-keeper Egerton. Anxiety of mind brought on him an attack of illness, and Elizabeth, who really esteemed him, sent him some broth from her own table, and, with tears in her eyes, desired the physician to tell him that, were it not for her honour, she would visit him herself.

After his recovery he was allowed to retire to his own house, where, in the society of his countess, the accomplished daughter of Walsingham and widow of Sir Philip Sidney, he devoted himself to literature, the study of which he had never neglected. The accounts of the success of Mountjoy, who had succeeded him in Ireland, and the injudicious expressions of popular feeling in his favour, gave strength to the arguments of his enemies; and the queen directed that he should be examined before the privy council. He made no defence, throwing himself, in a strain of affecting eloquence, on the queen's mercy. The sentence passed was, that he should not exercise any of his offices, and should confine himself to his own house. He behaved with the greatest humility and submission, and would probably have recovered his former state of favour, had not a slight circumstance occurred which caused his ruin.

A monopoly of sweet wines had been given to Essex for a term which had now expired; and, on his applying for a renewal of it, the queen refused, saying she must first learn its value, and that an unruly

\* "When I did come into her presence," says Harrington, "she chafed much, walked fastly to and fro, looked with discomposure on her visage, and I remember she caught my girdle when I kneeled to her, and swore 'I am no queen; that *man* is above me. Who gave him command to come here so soon? I did send him on other business.'"

beast must be stinted in its provender. Essex now fancied there was a settled design to destroy him; he began, therefore, to give ear to the evil suggestions of his secretary Cuffe and others, who recommended violent courses: he increased the number of his dependants, and even took the opinions of some divines on the lawfulness of using force against a sovereign. Some of the most zealous of the Puritan clergy (a party which, like Leicester, he always favoured) recommended his cause to the citizens in their lectures. He even opened a correspondence with the King of Scots, assuring him that Cecil and the other ministers were in favour of the Infanta, and advising him to assert his right to the succession, in which he offered to support him with his life and fortune. In his imprudence, he could not even refrain from using disparaging language of the queen, such as saying "she was now grown an old woman, and was as crooked in mind as in body." All this was conveyed to the queen's ear by his enemies among the court ladies.\*

Drury House, the residence of the Earl of Southampton, was the place where the principal malecontents were accustomed to meet: but Essex himself was never present. Plans were formed for seizing the palace, and obliging the queen to dismiss his enemies, and alter her mode of governing. The suspicions of the ministers had been awakened, and, on the 7th of February, 1601, Essex was summoned before the council. He feigned illness; in the night his friends resorted to him, and, as the next day was Sunday, and the principal citizens would be assembled, according to custom, at St. Paul's Cross, it was resolved, if possible, to induce them to follow him to the palace.

\* Elizabeth had always been excessively vain of her person; and, although she was now approaching seventy, she still thought herself by no means devoid of attractions: the incense of flattery was as grateful to her as ever, and Essex could have done nothing that she was so sure keenly to feel and resent as his speaking contemptuously of her beauty.—*Am. Ed.*

VOL. III.—L

In the morning, the lord-keeper and some others were sent to Essex House. They were admitted through the wicket, but their attendants were excluded; and, after some altercation, they were confined in one of the rooms. Essex then issued forth, at the head of about eighty knights and gentlemen, and, on the way to the city, he was joined by about two hundred others: but, on reaching St. Paul's, he found no one there. He advanced, shouting, "For the queen! for the queen! a plot is laid for my life!" but few noticed him. Soon after, the lords Burleigh and Cumberland entered the city, proclaiming him a traitor: he attempted to return home, but was repulsed by the guard at Ludgate, when he entered a boat at Queenhithe, and returned by water. He found his prisoners gone; soldiers began to surround the house; cannon were brought from the Tower; and Lord Sands advised a sally sword in hand: but Essex did not yet despair, and surrendered himself on the promise of a fair trial.

Essex and Southampton were brought to trial on the 19th, before a jury of twenty-five peers. As some of them were his personal enemies, he claimed a right to challenge them: but this privilege was refused by the judges. The facts were easily proved, though Essex denied all intention of injuring the queen; and they were both found guilty. Essex said that, for himself, he would neither solicit nor refuse mercy, but he hoped the life of his friend would be spared, who had been influenced only by affection for him. Southampton threw himself at once on the mercy of the queen.

In prison Essex was attended by Ashton, his favourite divine, who awoke in his bosom such a degree of spiritual terror and of remorse, that he made a most ample confession, disclosing the secrets of his friends, and even aggravating the guilt into which their regard for him had led them. He requested, it is said, to be executed within the walls of the Tower. The conflict of passions usual to the queen's bosom on such occasions now took place. She signed the war-

rant, shortly after she countermanded it, but at length suffered the execution to take place.\*

On the 25th of February, at eight in the morning, Essex was led to the scaffold. He behaved with great devoutness and resignation, acknowledging the justice of his sentence, and calling his offence "a great sin, a bloody sin, a crying and infectious sin." The first blow of the axe deprived him of sense and motion; at the third the head was separated from his body; and thus, when only in his thirty-fourth year, was terminated the mortal existence of the gallant Earl of Essex, a man too frank and unreserved to be able long to maintain himself against such shrewd and skilful opponents as Raleigh and Cecil, and too headstrong, imprudent, petulant, and arrogant, to avoid offending his fond but haughty mistress.

The life of Southampton was spared: but Essex's step-father, Sir Christopher Blount, his secretary Cuffe, and his steward Merrick, were executed.

The only event of much importance during the remainder of the queen's reign was the reduction of Tirone and the other Irish chiefs by the deputy Mountjoy, in 1602. The King of Spain had sent a body of six thousand men to their aid, under Juan d'Aguilar and Alfonso O'Campo: but these commanders were obliged to capitulate to the lord-deputy at Kinsale and Baltimore.

The brilliant career of Elizabeth was now drawing to its close. By her great temperance she had enjoyed good health and spirits through a long life. In the spring of 1602, when the Duke of Nevers was entertained by her at Richmond, she opened the ball with him in a gaillarde, which she danced with grace and

\* Elizabeth was undoubtedly most sincere in the irresolution and reluctance which she manifested on this occasion. Her fondness for Essex was very great, and, had any intercession been made in his behalf, it is believed she would have pardoned him. Such intercession his enemies took special care to prevent; and the queen attributing it to the haughtiness of her rebellious favourite that no appeal was made to her mercy, signed the warrant for his execution more from resentment and offended pride than anything else.—*Am. Ed.*

spirit; and in the autumn she made her annual progress, riding out to view the sports of the field, and having dancing in her private chamber. But her spirits now gradually sank, and she became silent and melancholy. The memory of Essex augmented her dejection; and the visible decrease of her popularity, in consequence of his execution, added to her pain. But, in fact, nature was giving way, and life had ceased to yield enjoyment.

Towards the end of January, 1603, though she was at the time much indisposed, she removed on a wet and stormy day to Richmond. She there grew worse: nevertheless, she would not attend to the advice of her physicians. The death of her relative and friend, the Countess of Nottingham,\* occurring soon after, afflicted her greatly. She now failed daily; and her sighs† and tears were frequent. On the 10th of March she fell into a stupor, and lay for some time seemingly dead. When she at length recovered, she had cushions brought to lie on: for she would not go to bed, being persuaded that, if she did, she should never rise again. Thus she continued for ten days, refusing both food

\* The well-known story of the ring—given by the Queen to Essex, and which he sent to her by the Countess of Nottingham, who, by Cecil's advice, did not deliver it—rests on the authority of Aubrey and Osborne, and is generally regarded as apocryphal.‡

† "In all my lifetime before," says Lord Monmouth, "I never heard her fetch a sigh but when the Queen of Scots was beheaded. Then, upon my knowledge, she shed many tears and sighs."

‡ Still we find this story related, as being worthy of credit, by the most respectable historians. It is simply this: that at a time when Essex was in high favour with Elizabeth, she presented him with a ring as a pledge of her affection: directing him, if ever he should be in difficulty, or from any cause should fall under her displeasure, that he should send it to her, and on its receipt he might be assured of her interposition and forgiveness. This precious token he confided in his last extremity to the Countess of Nottingham, to be conveyed by her to the queen; which, however, through the instigation of her husband, a bitter enemy of Essex, she treacherously neglected to do; and thus the unfortunate nobleman was deprived of his last and only hope of being saved from an ignominious death. It is also related that these facts were revealed to Elizabeth by the conscience-stricken countess on her dying bed; and that she was overwhelmed with grief and rage at their disclosure, saying to the terrified countess, then in her last moments, "God may forgive you, but I never can," and rushing immediately out of the room.—*Am. Ed.*

and medicine. The prelates who were about her urged her to provide for her spiritual safety, and commend her soul to God. She mildly replied, "That I have done long ago." The lord-admiral, who had most influence over her, at length prevailed, partly by entreaty and partly by force, in getting her to bed. On the morning of the 23d, the lord-admiral, the lord-keeper, and secretary Cecil asked her whom she would wish to be her successor; to which she replied, "My seat has been the seat of kings; I will have no rascal's son, but a king."\* When asked to explain, she said, "Who should that be but our cousin of Scotland?" During the day she became speechless. In the afternoon, when the primate and the other prelates had left her, the councillors returned, and Cecil asked her if she still continued in her resolution; "whereat, suddenly heaving herself upward in her bed, and pulling her arms out of bed, she held her hands jointly over her head in form of a crown." At six in the evening she made signs for the archbishop and her chaplains. The primate examined her respecting her faith; she replied by signs; and he prayed with her, at her desire, till it was late in the night. He then retired; and, at the hour of three in the morning, the queen gently yielded up her spirit. At ten o'clock King James was proclaimed.

This great queen had nearly attained the age of seventy years, during forty-five of which she had occupied the throne. When we look back on the dangers she surmounted, the power and influence which she acquired both at home and abroad, the respect in which she was held by foreigners, and the admiration and affection extended to her by her own subjects, we must at once acknowledge the greatness of her character. Elizabeth possessed great vigour of mind, prudence, sagacity, and penetration. She knew how to select those best adapted for the public service, and steadily supported them against the arts and intrigues of their

\* By the term "rascal's son" she is said to have meant Lord Beauchamp, the son of Catharine Grey (above, p. 25), whose name had been mentioned as representative of the house of Suffolk.



enemies. In her deportment she was majestic; in her manners affable and courteous, but still the sovereign;\* in her dress and style of living, splendid and magnificent. She was fond of popularity, and omitted no honest art to gain it.

The defects of this great princess were those of the woman. She loved dress overmuch, she was a coquette by nature, and delighted in the language of gallant and courtly adulation. She was an excessive admirer of beauty in the other sex, and indulged in familiarities of act and language towards her favourites highly indecorous when judged by the present standard. Hence her inveterate enemies have taken occasion to charge her with licentiousness. Their representations, however, are incredible in themselves, and utterly devoid of proof.† In her temper Elizabeth was prone to anger: she often struck those with whom she was offended, and oaths were familiar to her lips. She was frequently vacillating and uncertain in her resolutions, and was capable of, and sometimes practised, profound dissimulation. Towards the close of her reign her frugality approached the character of parsimony.

But these defects were redeemed by her great qual-

\* "Her mind," says Harrington, "was ofttime like the gentle air that cometh from the westerly point in a summer's morn; 'twas sweet and refreshing to all around her.... Again, she could put forth such alterations, when obedience was lacking, as left no doubtings whose daughter she was." A little farther on he says, "When she smiled it was a pure sunshine that every one did chuse to bask in if they could; but anon came a storm from a sudden gathering of clouds, and the thunder fell in wondrous manner on all alike."

† The following passage of Castelnau, the French ambassador, who knew Elizabeth and her court intimately, we think suffices to refute these slanders: "Et si l'on a voulu taxer fausement d'avoir de l'amour, je dirai avec vérité que ce sont inventions forgées de ses malveillans et de cabinets des ambassadeurs pour dégouter de son alliance ceux aux quels elle eut été utile"—[And if there have been those who chose falsely to accuse her of licentiousness, I can say truly that such charges are but the inventions of malicious persons, and of the cabinets of foreign ministers, for the purpose of disgusting from her those whom she had befriended].—Mem., i., 62.

ities, and posterity confirms, and ever will confirm, the judgment of her contemporaries, which placed Elizabeth in the very first rank among sovereigns.

The court of Elizabeth was gay and splendid, and contrasted strongly with the gloom of that of the latter years of her fanatical sister. Still it is not to be denied that it partook somewhat of the dissolute character of the times; and it certainly could not vie, in decorum and morality, with the present court of England.

The heaviest charge brought against Elizabeth and her government is the persecution of the Catholics. Let us, however, calmly consider the state of the case. During the greater part of Elizabeth's reign there was a pretender to the throne, whose title the Catholics, in general, regarded as better than hers; conspiracies were continually formed against her; and she had been spiritually outlawed by the pope. To guard against the evils which menaced the queen and the Protestant religion, severe laws were passed by the legislature; and a number of those who violated them were executed, not on account of their religion, but, as was constantly asserted, as traitors.\* The mode of execution was that which had been in use for centuries. It certainly was most barbarous and cruel: but the queen directed a mitigation of it, at least in London. As to those who suffered, many of them appear to have been upright and conscientious men: but they knew the law, and they wilfully violated it.† We are far from justifying severe and cruel laws, and as sincere advocates for the rights of conscience as any: but we would have Elizabeth and her

\* Sir Edward Coke declared that "in all her late majesty's time, by the space of forty-four years and upward, there were for treasonable practices executed in all not thirty priests, nor above five receivers and harbourers of them; and *for religion not any one.*"—Jardine, *Crim. Trials*, ii., 133.

† "There seems to be good reason for doubting whether any one who was executed might not have saved his life by explicitly denying the pope's power to depose the queen."—Hallam.

ministers judged by the maxims of their age. Toleration, it should be remembered, was then a thing unknown.

The persecution of the Puritans in this reign has not the same plea of self-defence in its favour: it is another instance of the bigoted and intolerant spirit of the age.

The reign of Elizabeth was also deformed by the horrid practice of burning as heretics those who went farther than the party in power had chosen to go in their secession from Rome. Four persons suffered under the writ "*De hæretico comburendo*"—*for burning heretics*. A single voice, that of honest John Foxe, the martyrologist, was raised, but raised in vain, against depriving men of their lives for their religious opinions.

In consequence of the suppression of monasteries, the increase of pasturage and enclosures, and the natural progress of population in a period of domestic peace and tranquillity, the practice of mendicancy had grown to an alarming extent. Various fruitless attempts having been made from the time of Henry VIII. to suppress it, an act was finally passed (44 Eliz., ch. 2) enacting that all maimed and impotent persons should be provided for at the expense of their respective parishes, and that employment should be found for the unemployed able-bodied poor. This was the origin of the Poor-laws, which form so conspicuous a feature of subsequent English legislation.

The queen favoured commerce and maritime enterprise, being well aware of the importance of naval power for the defence of the realm. The trade which had been opened with Russia in her sister's reign, when English vessels penetrated through the Icy Sea to Archangel, was continued; and adventurous merchants conveyed their goods thence to the Caspian, and sold them in Persia. Commercial intercourse was also opened with Turkey. But the efforts of the queen for the promotion of trade were, in a great measure, frustrated by the practice of granting patents of monopoly, which she carried to a greater ex-

tent than had been done by her predecessors. To her frugal temper this seemed a thrifty mode of gratifying her courtiers, and rewarding the meritorious. The grantees sold their patents to companies of traders, who put on their articles the highest possible prices that purchasers could pay : salt, for example, being thus raised from 15*d.* to 15*s.* a bushel.\* Scarcely a single article of consumption had escaped the rapacity of the courtiers :† but, in 1601, when the matter had produced a great ferment in the commons, the prudent queen promised that she would revoke all such patents as should be proved injurious.

The reign of Elizabeth was also a period of literary glory. Hitherto the name of Chaucer had stood almost alone on the rolls of poetic genius : but now a noble band appeared, who were to place England on a level with Greece and Italy. Who is not familiar with the great names of Shakspeare and Spenser, the chiefs of this poetic choir ? In prose, too, Hooker was the first to give proof of the depth and force, the dignity and harmony, of which the English language is susceptible.

Newspapers, now so numerous and of such importance, first appeared in England during the reign of Elizabeth. In the year of the Armada, a gazette, called the Mercury, was established.

\* From 30 cts. to \$3 60.

† When the list was read in the house in 1601, a member cried, "Is not bread in the number ?" "Bread !" cried the rest, in amazement. "Nay," said he, "if no remedy is found for this, bread will be there before the next parliament."

## CHAPTER IV.

## ENGLAND UNDER THE TUDORS.

Power of the Crown.—House of Commons.—Court of Star Chamber.—Court of High Commission.—Wardship.—Younger Brothers.—Leigers or Resident Ambassadors.

THE period during which the throne of England was occupied by the house of Tudor was one of transition both in politics and religion. The crown, during this period, acquired a degree of strength and influence unknown to the Plantagenets: but the power which was to control it was also secretly growing up. This new power was the commons; for those who had in reality withstood the prerogative of the Edwards and the Henries were the ancient nobility, the feudal aristocracy, beneath whose protection the house of commons acted against the crown. But the war of the Roses, and various natural and political causes, had thinned the ranks and broken the power of the feudal baronage; and the commons, without leaders or support, had become timid and submissive. A new nobility, indebted to royal favour for its honours, and to royal munificence or profusion for its wealth, by degrees sprang up.\* It was naturally cautious, subservient, and self-seeking; and we have seen, on numerous occasions, how abjectly it obeyed the royal will. Had it not been for the spirit breathed by the Reformation, which gradually infused vigour and courage into the breasts of the commons, the sacred flame of liberty might have become extinct. It is not to be denied, that to the Puritans we are mainly indebted for its conservation.

Under Henry VIII. the commons were in their

\* Only a small portion of the English nobility, such as the Howards, the Stanleys, the Nevilles, the Percies, and the Courtenays, can trace their honours beyond the time of the Tudors.

most feeble condition: for the very circumstance to which they owed their future strength, namely, the Reformation, contributed to augment the power of the despot, who, holding the balance between the two parties, was courted by both; and neither would risk the forfeiture of his favour or incur his displeasure by any efforts in the cause of the national liberties. Yet, servile as was the house of commons under Henry, it sometimes ventured to resist the attempts of the crown to obtain money. Under Edward VI. the commons began to show some symptoms of returning vigour. They ventured to reject several bills sent down from the lords. The parliaments of Mary proved, as we have seen, refractory on several points; and the Puritanic spirit, which began to assume strength in the time of Elizabeth, manifested itself, on various occasions, by an opposition to the court, so strong as to cause that prudent princess to recede from measures which she had proposed, and to promise compliance with the wishes of the commons.

The strongest proof which could be afforded of the growing power of the house of commons was the anxiety of the court to procure influence in it. This was effected either by creating new boroughs, or by restoring the right of election to such old boroughs as, on account of the expense of paying their representatives, had neglected its use. Care, of course, was always taken to select those places in which the crown or its supporters had influence; and in this manner numbers of the servants of the court obtained seats in the house of commons. In the reign of Edward, two-and-twenty boroughs were thus created or restored; Mary added fourteen more, and Elizabeth continued the practice. We thus see that Time was not the only agent in the production of rotten boroughs.\*

Thus the power of the crown, independent of the

\* An opprobrious designation applied to such small boroughs as, with no just claim, had, either by royal favour or otherwise, acquired a right to elect a representative to the house of commons. During the progress of reform in England within the last few years, the most objectionable of these borough privileges have been

parliament, was almost overwhelming, even under the later Tudors: it retained all its feudal prerogatives, with the addition of the ecclesiastical authority acquired by Henry VIII., and in the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission it had two mighty engines of oppression.

The origin of the court of Star Chamber was as follows. The *Curia Regis*, or royal council, had all along exercised a very arbitrary degree of power. As it usually sat in the apartment named the Star Chamber (from the stars with which it was adorned), it thence derived its appellation. It silently acquired the powers vested in the court erected by statute 3 of Henry VII. It served, as Sir Thomas Smith expresses it, "to bridle such stout noblemen or gentlemen which would offer wrong by force to any manner of men, and cannot be content to demand or defend the right by order of the law;" and so far it was beneficial. But it gradually extended its jurisdiction much farther, and took cognizance of such a number of offences as rendered it a powerful instrument of despotism. Thus it punished for scandalous reports with regard to persons in power, and for the spreading of seditious news. If a man refused to lend money as a benevolence,\* he was summoned before the council: as also were jurors who found verdicts contrary to the wishes of the crown. It punished by fine and imprisonment, and there was no appeal from its sentence.

Severe and arbitrary as the Star Chamber was in civil matters, a still more tyrannic tribunal took cognizance of affairs relating to religion. This was the court of High Commission: a miniature Inquisition, which was completed in the year 1580. The spirit of the times, which knew not toleration, was the true origin of this tribunal: but its germe appears to have been a com-

suppressed, and the elective franchise has been somewhat extended and equalized, though much still remains to be done to give to the English people a fair and honest representation.—*Am. Ed.*

\* That is, to lend money to the king on his request, which he gave himself very little trouble to repay.—*Am. Ed.*

mission granted by Queen Mary, in 1557, to certain prelates and others, to inquire after heresies, and to punish those who did not come to church, or who misbehaved themselves there, etc. The court of High Commission consisted of forty-four members, of whom twelve were bishops. They were to take cognizance of all violations of the acts of supremacy and uniformity, and of two other acts, either by deed, speech, or writing. They could punish those who absented themselves from church, and those guilty of incest, adultery, etc.; they might, *ex officio*, examine suspected persons on their oaths, and punish by fine, imprisonment, etc.; and they could visit and reform heresies and schisms, and deprive beneficed persons for holding doctrines contrary to the thirty-nine articles. In a word, their power had scarcely any limits, and by means of it a perfect despotism over opinion was established.

The feudal burdens continued to be as oppressive as ever. The lower orders of the people were sorely aggrieved by the abuses of purveyance;\* and wardship was a source of ruin to numbers of the gentry. The following picture of its evils is from the pen of an able statesman in the reign of Elizabeth.

“Many men,” says Sir Thomas Smith,† “do es-

\* Osborne relates the following anecdote. “A purveyor having abused the county of Kent, upon the queen’s remove to Greenwich, a countryman, watching the time she went to walk, which was commonly early, and being wise enough to take his time when she stood unbent and quiet from the ordinary occasions she was taken up with, placing himself within the reach of her ear, did, after the fashion of his caste, cry aloud, ‘Which is the queen?’ whereupon, as her manner was, she turned about towards him, and he continuing still his question, she herself answered, ‘I am your queen: what wouldst thou have with me?’ ‘You,’ replied the fellow, ‘are one of the rarest women I ever saw, and can eat no more than my daughter Madge, who is thought the properest lass in our parish, though short of you; but that Queen Elizabeth I look for devours so many of my hens, ducks, and capons that I am not able to live.’” The queen, it is added, pleased with the praise of her beauty, inquired who the purveyor was, and, as the story went, caused him to be hanged.

† Commonwealth of England, book iii., ch. 5.

VOL. III.—M



teem this wardship by knight's service very unreasonable and unjust, and contrary to nature, that a freeman and gentleman should be bought and sold like a horse or an ox, and so change guardians as masters and lords, at whose government not only his body, but his lands and his houses should be to be wasted and spent without accounts; and then to marry at the will of him who is his natural lord, or his will who has bought him, to such as he likes not peradventure, or else to pay so great a ransom. This is the occasion, they say, why many gentlemen be so evil brought up touching virtue and learning, and but only in daintiness and pleasure, and why they be married very young and before they be wise, and many times do not greatly love their wives. For when the father is dead, who hath the natural care of his child? not the mother, nor the uncle, nor the next of kin, who by all reason would have most natural care for the bringing up of the infant and minor: but the lord of whom he holdeth his land in the knight's service, be it the king or queen, duke, marquis, or any other, hath the government of his body and marriage, or else who that bought him at the first, second, or third hand. The prince, as having so many, must needs give or sell his wards away to other, and so he doth. Other do but seek which way they may make most advantage of him, as of an ox or other beast. These all, say they, have no natural care of the infant but of their own gain; and especially, the buyer will not suffer his ward to take any great pains either in study or any other hardness, lest he should be sick and die before he hath married his daughter, sister, or cousin, for whose sake he bought him; and then all his money which he paid for him should be lost. So he who had a father which kept a good house, and had all things in good order to maintain it, shall come to his own after he is out of wardship, woods decayed, houses fallen down; stock wasted and gone, lands lent forth and ploughed to the barren, and, to make amends, shall pay yet one year's rent for relief, and sue *ouster le maine*, besides other charges; so that not of many

years, and peradventure never, he shall be able to recover and come to the estate where his father left it."

The situation of the younger children of the nobility and gentry at this period, it may be here observed, was often lamentable, as there were not then the colonies, large land and sea forces, numerous public offices, etc., which now furnish so many situations for the families of the aristocracy. Younger sons sometimes sought to push their fortune at court, or went into the military service of foreign states, or engaged in naval enterprises. They not unfrequently became gamblers, sharpers, and even highway robbers. They were usually left dependant on their elder brother, or had a small annuity bequeathed them which he was to pay; and if, through vice or folly, he wasted his property, his brothers and sisters became his fellow-sufferers. The misery which younger brothers endured is thus, without exaggeration, portrayed by an eminent dramatic poet of those days. "Maybe," says a younger to an elder brother,

"Maybe you look'd I should petition to you  
As you went to your horse, flatter your servants  
To play the brokers for my furtherance,  
Sooth your worst humours, act the parasite  
On all occasions, write my name with theirs  
That are but one degree removed from slaves;  
Or play the pander, enter into quarrels,  
Although unjustly ground, and defend them  
Because they were yours. These are the tyrannies  
Most younger brothers groan beneath, yet bear them  
From the insulting heir."\*

Brilliant, therefore, on the whole, as were the days of Elizabeth, they were clouded, we see, with many and great evils. Tyranny and oppression were rife in the land; there was little security either of person or property; and, with all the splendour of the court, there was doubtless far less of general happiness than at the present day.

\* Fletcher's "Queen of Corinth," act i., scene ii. See also Shakespeare's "As you like it," and the old play called "The Miseries of Enforced Marriage," which likewise display the evils of wardship in strong colours.

In the time of the Tudors, on account of the more extended relations among the different European states, it became the custom to have resident ambassadors, or *Leigers*, as they were called, at the different courts, in order to obtain for their governments correct information of the state of public affairs. These leigers usually took an active part in the domestic concerns of the country in which they were resident : even fomenting, at times, rebellion and conspiracies, and encouraging, by every means in their power, opposition to the court. Much valuable information respecting the history of England under the Tudors and Stuarts has been derived from the despatches of the French and other resident ministers at the court of London. At the same time we must not, as is too often done, give implicit credit to all their statements. They, for the most part, laboured under the disadvantage of being ignorant of the English language, and their means of acquiring information were therefore comparatively limited. They had also, like other men, their passions and prejudices ; eagerly caught at what favoured their own views, and often transmitted to their courts, instead of fact, mere gossip and rumour.

# HOUSE OF STUART.—PART I.

---

## CHAPTER I.

JAMES I.\*

1603–1612.

**Accession of James.—Bye and Surprise Plots.—Hampton Court Conference.—Gunpowder Plot.—Death of Salisbury; of Prince Henry.—Arabella Stuart.**

ON the death of Queen Elizabeth, the right to the crown of England lay between the descendants of Margaret and Mary, daughters of Henry VII., married to the King of Scotland and to Brandon duke of Suffolk. By the last will of Henry VIII., sanctioned by an act of the legislature, the crown was settled on the latter in case of the failure of his own issue. The legal right, therefore, of the house of Suffolk was beyond dispute. But, on the other hand, the general feeling in favour of primogeniture and hereditary right was too strong to be thus overcome; and the advantages to be derived from the accession of the King of Scotland were so great, that the nation readily acquiesced in the final disposition of the late queen; so that James was proclaimed with as little opposition as if he had been heir-apparent to the crown.

During the latter years of Queen Elizabeth, the *Jesuit* portion of the Catholics† had been in secret correspondence with the King of Spain in reference

\* Authorities: Wilson, Weldon, and the papers in Winwood and other collections, &c.

† The English Catholics were divided into two parties: the *Jesuits*, as they were called, that is, the adherents of the Jesuits, and the followers of the secular clergy

to asserting the claim of his daughter, the Infanta : while others, under the sanction of the pope, who did not wish too much to aggrandize the house of Austria, looked to Arabella Stuart, daughter of the younger brother of James's father, alleging that her birth within the realm obviated, in law, her defect of primogeniture : for, though Arabella was a Protestant, they were not without hopes of her conversion. They did not, however, feel themselves strong enough to make any serious efforts in her favour ; and James, who had long been in secret communication with the court of Rome and the English Catholics, had given them reason to expect that they would enjoy freedom from molestation, at least, under his dominion.

After the death of Essex, Sir Robert Cecil had entered into secret and close relations with the King of Scotland, engaging to remove all difficulties in the way of his peaceful succession. His efforts to this end had been completely successful ; and James, on receiving due notification of his having been proclaimed, prepared to set forth at once for the *Land of Promise*, as he denominated it to his hungry and expectant favourites. The approaching change was to him great indeed : he was about to pass from a throne of most scanty revenues, and a realm where the royal authority was continually thwarted by a turbulent, ferocious nobility, and a stern, unyielding clergy, to a kingdom where the regal authority had long been almost uncontrolled, and where the revenues of the crown were splendid and ample.

On the 5th of April James departed from Edinburgh. When he entered England, the people everywhere poured forth in joyous crowds to meet him ; and the nobles, as he proceeded, entertained him sumptuously at their houses. But there was a striking contrast between the new king and their late courteous and magnificent sovereign. When Elizabeth was on a progress, she was splendidly habited ; her people had free access to her, and their proofs of affection were received with smiles and kind expressions, blended with the majesty and dignity in-

separable from her character and mien. But their new monarch they beheld meanly attired; for James was wholly indifferent to dress; his clothes being always of one fashion, quilted so as to be stiletto-proof, and worn till they were in tatters; his person, besides, was ungraceful, his limbs feeble, and his gait what, in the dialect of his country, is termed "*todlin*."\* His tongue was too large for his mouth, and thus augmented the uncouthness of his broad Northern accent. Under pretence of its enhancing the price of provisions, he forbade the people resorting to him on his way; he allowed ladies, it is said, to kneel to him, speaking, at the same time, in language derogatory of the fair sex in general. At Newark he ordered a pickpocket, taken in the act within the range of the court, to be executed without trial.† In short, by the time he reached London his popularity was wellnigh gone.

On his approach to the capital, James took up his abode for some days at Theobalds, the residence of Sir Robert Cecil, during which time he formed his council, by adding to that of the late queen's the following Scots: the Duke of Lennox, the Earl of Mar, Lord Hume, Lord Kinloss, Sir George Hume, and Sir James Elphinstone. A proclamation was next issued, holding forth hopes of a mitigation of the evils of monopolies, purveyance, and protections in law-suits. The king now began to shower his honours with a lavish hand on his subjects of both nations.

\* "I shall leave him dressed to posterity," says Osborne, "in the colours I saw him in the next progress after his inauguration, which was as green as the grass he trod on, with a feather in his cap and a horn instead of a sword by his side; how suitable to his age, calling, or person, I leave others to judge from his pictures; he owning a countenance not in the least regard semblable to any my eyes ever met with, besides a host dwelling in Ant-hill, formerly a shepherd, and so metaphorically of the same profession."

† "I hear our new king," writes Sir J. Harrington, "has hanged one man before he was tried; it is strangely done: now if the wind bloweth thus, why may not a man be tried before he has offended?"

Knighthood, for example, was bestowed with such profusion, that in the course of three months he had conferred that honour on not less than seven hundred persons. A pasquinade thereon was affixed to St. Paul's, entitled, "A Help for Weak Memories to retain the Names of the Nobility."\*

The principal distinctions conferred were as follows : Cecil was created successively Baron Essington, Viscount Cranburne, and Earl of Salisbury ; Lord Buckhurst was made Earl of Dorset ; Lord Pembroke's brother Philip Earl of Montmorency ; and the chancellor Egerton became Baron of Ellesmere. James also, to evince his gratitude to the friends of himself and his mother, released the Earl of Southampton from the Tower, and restored both him and the son of the Earl of Essex to their estates and honours. He likewise admitted into the council Thomas Howard, the son, and Henry, the brother of the late Duke of Norfolk ; and, some time after, created the former Earl of Suffolk, and the latter Earl of Northampton. He restored also the title of Arundel and Surrey to Thomas, son of Philip, the eldest son of that unhappy duke.

Ambassadors from foreign powers now arrived, to congratulate James on his accession. Henry IV. of France sent his friend and minister the Marquis Rosni (afterward Duke of Sully) to study the character of the new monarch, and endeavour to persuade him to join in an extensive league against the house of Austria. Sully, on his arrival, prepared to put himself and suite in deep mourning, out of respect to the memory of the late queen : but he gave up the de-

\* In the distribution of his favours, James was accused by his English subjects of showing undue partiality to his Scottish favourite, and great discontent was produced. So loud, indeed, were the public complaints, that the king was induced to notice them in an address to his parliament, in which he promises that there shall be no cause for dissatisfaction in future, while for the past he offers the following singular apology. "Had I," he says, "been oversparing to them" (the Scots), "they might have thought that Joseph had forgotten his brethren, or that the king had been drunk with his new kingdom."—*Am. Ed*

sign on being assured by the resident ambassador that he would thereby give mortal offence at court.\* He found James so bent on peace with Spain, that he would only engage to aid the Dutch underhand. Sully's opinion of the British monarch is briefly given in his own expression, that he was "the wisest fool in Christendom."

It may be useful to give here some farther account of King James. He was at this time thirty-six years of age. His education had been confided to the celebrated George Buchanan:† but, though the tutor had been one of the ablest asserters of the doctrine that all power proceeds from the people, and that to them the holder is answerable for the exercise of it, the pupil had adopted the most extravagant ideas of the extent of the royal prerogative. Flattered by courtiers, and regarding himself as the representative not only of the endless line of Scottish monarchs, but also of the Saxon and Norman lines in England, he considered the people as made for kings, who are to them as shepherds to their flocks, and accountable to God alone for their trust. As he was learned, and wrote with facility, he had imbodied his notions in a work for the use of his son, which he entitled the "*Basilikon Doron*," or *Royal Gift*. He had also published works on demonology,‡ and other subjects but

\* James affected to speak slightly of Elizabeth; but, since he offered to appear as chief mourner at her funeral, his forbidding mourning at court may have had its source in his aversion from gloom. He did the same on the death of his own son.

† This learned and excellent man was, by all accounts, most faithful to his charge. He laboured unceasingly to correct the errors of his pupil, and to instil into his mind sentiments becoming his exalted destination. He seems, however, to have been fully aware of the difficulty, not to say hopelessness, of his task; for when, upon a certain occasion, he was asked how he came to make his royal pupil a pedant, he replied, "I was happy to accomplish even that."—*Am. Ed.*

‡ James, like most people in those days, had full faith in witchcraft. To doubt it, indeed, he seems to have considered the most shocking impiety; for he thus speaks of the heterodox sentiments of a certain individual on this subject: "The damnable opinions of one Scot, an Englishman, who is not ashamed to deny in pub-



little suited to the pen of a monarch. He was, in truth, a royal pedant (a very rare character), with large stores of acquired knowledge, and not without shrewdness and sagacity, but wanting in wisdom. By his flatterers he was styled the British Solomon—a title which he not only suffered to be conferred on him, but which he frequently applied to himself.

By his union with Anne, sister of the King of Denmark, James had now surviving two sons, Henry and Charles, and one daughter, Elizabeth. The queen was a woman of an intriguing, ambitious spirit, and fond of amusement and gayety. Prince Henry, as he grew up, developed a character every way opposite to that of his father.

James was scarcely well seated on his throne, when a double conspiracy, it was said, was formed against him. The one was called the "Bye," the "Surprise," or the "Surprising Plot," for reasons which will presently appear. The chief actors in it were two secular Romish priests, named Watson and Clarkè; Sir Griffin Markham, a Catholic gentleman; George Brooke, brother of Lord Cobham (who himself had knowledge of it), and Lord Grey of Wilton, the head of the Puritans. Common discontent was the only principle of union among these discordant elements. Their plan was to surprise and seize the king, and convey him to the Tower or Dover Castle, and there oblige him to grant a full pardon to all concerned, secure toleration to the Catholic religion, and dismiss his privy council. Watson, it was said, was then to be made chancellor, Brooke treasurer, Markham principal secretary, and Grey marshal and master of the horse. The latter, however, finding the Catholics to predominate in their councils, withdrew himself from them; and, one thing or another causing the execution of their plan to be deferred, Cecil came to the knowl-

He that there be such a thing as witchcraft, and so maintains the old error of the Sadducees in denying of spirits." James published also, in addition to the works here named, a metrical translation of the greater part of the Psalms, but little creditable to his muse.—*Am. Ed.*

edge of it,\* and the principal conspirators were arrested.

The other plot was called the "Main," or the "Spanish Treason." The chief parties in this were said to be Sir Walter Raleigh, Lord Cobham, and George Brooke. Its object, as was asserted, was to place Arabella Stuart on the throne, by the aid of Spanish money and a Spanish army. Brooke formed the link between the Main and the Bye. When the latter plot was discovered, Raleigh was arrested as a suspicious person: but, as he was really ignorant of it, nothing could be brought against him, and he was discharged. A letter, however, which he wrote to Cobham, to put him on his guard, having been intercepted, they were both committed to the Tower.

The court being at Winchester on account of the plague, the two priests, Brooke and Markham, with Sir Edward Parham and two other gentlemen, were arraigned there on the 15th of November. Parham was acquitted, but all the rest were found guilty. On the 17th Raleigh was brought to trial. The only evidence against him was the declaration of Cobham: for, when the latter was on his examination, on the 20th of July, he was shown a note from Raleigh to Cecil, hinting that he, Cobham, had intelligence with Aremberg, the Spanish minister; and he then declared that he would tell the whole truth, and revealed what, according to his account, was Raleigh's project. Against this, however, Raleigh produced a letter, written subsequently by Cobham, fully acquitting him: in reply to which, again, the council for the crown gave in another letter, written by Cobham only the night before, repeating his charge. The prosecution was conducted in the most virulent manner by Sir Edward Coke, then attorney-general. Raleigh defended himself with great skill, temper, and dignity: but the jury (which was a packed one), insufficient as the evidence was, found him guilty, and he was sentenced to die. To use Raleigh's own words, "it was as unjust a con-

† He is said to have had his information from the Jesuit party.

demnation, without proof or testimony, as ever man had." The king himself, as Raleigh afterward asserted, prayed that he might never be tried by a Middlesex jury. It is likewise said, that when Coke, as he was walking in the castle garden, heard that the jury had found Raleigh guilty of high treason, he exclaimed, "Surely thou art mistaken: I myself accused him but of misprision of treason." Osborne says that "some of the jury were afterward so touched in conscience as to demand of Raleigh pardon on their knees."

On the following Friday Cobham was tried by his peers. He behaved in the most abject manner possible, throwing the whole blame on his brother and Raleigh. He was found guilty without hesitation. The next day Grey was arraigned. He defended himself with great spirit and ability: but the evidence was too strong against him, and he also was condemned.

The two priests were hung, and embowelled in the usual barbarous manner before they were dead. Brooke was beheaded. Markham was led to the scaffold, but just then a messenger came from court, and whispered to the sheriff, who gave the prisoner two hours' respite, and took him away. Grey was next brought out, but the sheriff withdrew him also, saying that Cobham was to precede him. Cobham, when he came on the scaffold, "did much cozen the world," for he showed the greatest firmness and resolution. He expressed deep sorrow for his offence to the king, and "took it upon the hope of his soul's resurrection, that what he had said of Raleigh was true." The sheriff then told him that he must be confronted with some other persons. Grey and Markham were immediately led forth; and, while they all three gazed on each other in amazement, the sheriff announced to them that the king granted them their lives. Markham was banished the kingdom; Cobham was deprived of his offices and estates, and died some years after in the utmost misery; and Grey remained a prisoner in the Tower to the time of his death, in 1614. Raleigh's life, also, was spared for the present.

The preceding drama was a device of the king's, who certainly was not a man of blood. It is quite evident, that one object in view was to obtain what might be regarded as Cobham's dying assertion of the guilt of Raleigh: for, though cowards sometimes die with courage, there is reason to believe that Cobham's magnanimity was the result of a knowledge that his life was not in danger. The king was inimical to Raleigh as being the enemy of Essex, and one of those who had proposed that he should not be permitted to mount the throne except on certain conditions. Cecil was also the enemy of Raleigh, whose talents he feared; so that, on the whole, we think there is some probability in the hypothesis, that Cobham was merely made a tool of by him and Lord Henry Howard, in fixing the charge of treason on Raleigh, in order that he might thus be immured for the rest of his days. It is most likely that there was no intention of touching his life. As to the intrigue with Spain, with which Raleigh was charged, it seems contradicted by the entire tenour of his life and actions.\*

The next affair which occupied the attention of King James was one more congenial to his disposition. When he was on his way from Scotland to London, the Puritan clergy presented their Millenary petition,† praying for reform in the church. They desired that the sign of the cross should not be made in baptism, and that that rite should not be administered by women; that the ring should be disused in marriage; that confirmation should be abolished; that the clergy should not wear the cap and surplice, nor teach the people to bow at the name of Jesus; that the service should be curtailed, and that the Apocrypha should not be read as part of it; that church music should be reformed; and that the Lord's day should not be profaned, nor the observation of other holydays enjoined. They also prayed that none but able men

\* See Jardine's *Criminal Trials*, vol. i., and Cayley's and Tytler's *Lives of Sir Walter Raleigh*.

† So called, as it was to have been signed by one thousand (*mille*) clergymen.

should be ordained, and that they should be obliged to reside within their parishes or cures; that bishops should not hold livings *in commendam*;\* that men should not be excommunicated for small matters, etc. The two universities forthwith set forth violent declarations against the petitioners, and in favour of the present state of the church. But the king, having been brought up in the kirk of Scotland, which rejected all that was complained of, could not with decency slight the petition. He therefore, on the 24th of October, issued a proclamation for a conference between the two parties, to be held in his own presence at Hampton Court.

This conference was opened on the 14th of January, 1604. On the side of the church appeared the primate Whitgift, Bancroft, bishop of London, seven other prelates, and eight dignitaries: the Puritans were represented by Dr. Reynolds and three others, who had been selected by the king himself. The first day the Puritan advocates were not admitted; and the king made a speech, in which he expressed his joy that "he was now come into the promised land; that he sat among grave and reverend men, and was not a king, as formerly, without state, nor in a place where beardless boys would brave him to his face."† He assured them that he did not propose to make any innovation, but only to remove such disorders as might be shown evidently to exist. He then suggested some slight alterations in the liturgy with respect to absolution and confirmation; and objected to baptism by women and lay persons. The amendments which he proposed were adopted without hesitation; and the next day, the 16th, the Puritans hav-

\* A church living or benefice was said to be held *in commendam*, when, being vacated by its regular incumbent, the bishop might *commend* or appoint some clerk or person in orders temporarily to take the spiritual charge of it—that is, until it should be provided with a permanent pastor. This was a power which might be, and doubtless often was, greatly abused.—*Am. Ed.*

† Alluding to the rudeness which he had experienced from some hotheaded young ministers in Scotland, of which various instances are on record.

ing been admitted, the king required them to state their objections. To each one of their arguments James himself replied. At length, when Reynolds made proposals for holding assemblies of the clergy, and referring cases from them to the diocesan synod, the king lost his temper. He told them that they were aiming at a Scots presbytery, "which," said he, "agrees with monarchy as well as God and the devil. Then Jack and Tom and Will and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasure censure both me and my council. Therefore, pray stay one seven years before you demand that of me; and if then you find me pury and fat, and my windpipe stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you: for let that government be up, and I am sure I shall be kept in breath." Then turning to the bishops, and putting his hand to his hat, he said, "My lords, I may thank *you* that these Puritans plead for my supremacy; for, if once you are out and they in place, I know what will become of my supremacy; for, No bishop, no king." He then asked Reynolds if he had anything more to say: but that divine, finding the cause prejudged, declined to proceed. "If this be all your party have to say," said the king, rising, "I will make them conform themselves, or else hurry them out of this land, or do worse." The prelates were overjoyed at the behaviour of the king. Whitgift protested that he had spoken from the spirit of God. Bancroft exclaimed, "I protest, my heart melteth with joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us a king as, since Christ's time, hath not been." The chancellor said "he had never seen the king and priest so fully united in one person."\*

The next day the Puritans were called in to hear the alterations made in the Prayer-book. Their entreaties for indulgence to some men of tender conscience only excited anger. The conference thus terminated; and, on the 5th of March, a proclamation

\* In our ears this sounds as monstrous and almost impious flattery. Such it would be at the present day, no doubt: but exaggerated expressions of praise or blame were in the style of that age.

was issued, enjoining strict conformity. Persecution of the Nonconformists speedily commenced, and three hundred ministers were punished by suspension, deprivation, and other modes.

On the 19th of March the king met his first parliament. In the commons the redress of grievances, chiefly those of purveyance and the feudal incidents, was anxiously sought, and an equivalent in revenue was proposed to be given to the crown. Attempts were also made to have the laws mitigated in favour of the Puritans, while those against the Catholics were increased in severity. The king, finding he had little chance of obtaining a subsidy, sent to signify that he would not require it, and the parliament then separated.

During the summer a peace was concluded with the court of Spain on sufficiently honourable terms; and James, having now no foreign affairs to disturb him, devoted himself to his studies, his hunting, and his other amusements. Meanwhile a few fanatic Catholics were busily engaged in a project for destroying himself, his family, and both houses of parliament. We speak of the Gunpowder-Plot, of which we will now narrate the particulars.\*

At the time James was looking to the succession to the crown of England, he naturally sought to engage all parties in his interest. The Catholics were still numerous and wealthy, and it is not to be doubted that he held out to them hopes of toleration. They were, therefore, zealous in his favour; and on his part, he ceased for two years to levy the fines for recusancy. He, however, had little real liking for their religion; and he more than once publicly declared his intention of treading in the footsteps of Elizabeth. Moreover, his Scottish favourites, having in many cases expended their small patrimonies, were craving for supplies; and he therefore put the law against recusancy again in force, and assigned these persons pensions off the

\* See the excellent account of it which forms the second volume of Jardine's *Criminal Trials*.

lands and properties of the Catholics, which were doubtless levied with insolence and severity. This, and the enactment of new provisions against their religion in the late parliament, convinced them that they had little favour to expect. They were, therefore, highly irritated, no doubt, but generally had no thoughts of seeking redress by force, being averse to civil conflicts, or aware of their inferiority in strength.

There were, however, some spirits of a different kind among them. Robert Catesby, a gentleman of good property in Northampton and Warwickshire, descended from the minister of Richard III., had been brought up a Catholic : but he deserted that religion, plunged into all sorts of excesses, and ran through his patrimony. In 1598 he returned to his old faith ; and, making up for his apostacy by zeal, became a fanatic, engaging in all the treasons and conspiracies which agitated the latter years of Elizabeth. He now conceived the diabolical project of blowing up the parliament-house with gunpowder. This design he communicated, during Lent, in 1604, to John Wright and Thomas Winter, two gentlemen of the same faith, of good character, family, and fortune. The latter hesitated at first, but his scruples soon gave way, and he went over to the Netherlands on a double mission : the one to induce the Constable of Castile, who was coming over to conclude a peace, to make some stipulations in favour of the Catholics ; the other to engage in the plot some gentlemen of courage, possessing military knowledge and experience. Finding that the court of Spain would not hazard the peace which was so necessary to it on their account, he proceeded to execute the other part of his commission ; and the person on whom he fixed was one Guy Fawkes, a man of good family in Yorkshire, who, having spent his little property, had entered the Spanish service. If we may credit Father Greenway, the associate and panegyrist of the conspirators, Fawkes was " a man of great piety, of exemplary temperance, of mild and cheerful demeanour, an enemy of broils and disputes, a faithful friend, and remarkable for his punctual at-



tendance upon religious observances:" in a word, no doubt a fanatic, in whose eyes the plea of religion justified every deed. Though this high-wrought character is doubtless beyond the truth, there seems, on the other hand, to be no ground for regarding Fawkes as a mere vulgar ruffian.

Winter and Fawkes came to London in the month of April. Catesby then communicated the project to Thomas Percy, a kinsman of the Earl of Northumberland, whose steward he was, and who had been sent by him to Scotland, before the queen's death, to ascertain James's sentiments towards the Catholics. He had reported most favourably, and he was not a little mortified at having been so completely deceived in his expectations. Like Catesby, he had been a debauchee, and was now a fanatic.

Catesby, Wright, Winter, Percy, and Fawkes, having met by appointment in a house behind Clement's Inn, took an oath on the Holy Trinity and the sacrament never to disclose what was then to be proposed. Percy and Fawkes were after this informed of the plan, of which they both approved; and then, in an upper room of the same house, they heard mass, and received the sacrament at the hands of Father Gerard, a Jesuit; who, whatever may be our suspicions, so far as we have evidence, was not acquainted either with their vow or its object.

A tenement adjoining the parliament-house was now taken in Percy's name; and Fawkes, under the assumed name of Johnson, and as Percy's servant, was put in charge of it. Another house was hired at Lambeth, where the powder, and the timber for the construction of the mine which they proposed to run, might be collected; and the care of it was committed to one Robert Keyes, who was likewise sworn to secrecy. Parliament having been adjourned to the 7th of February following, the conspirators went down to the country, agreeing to meet again in November. During the summer and autumn the proceedings of the government against the Catholics were extremely rigorous, and several Jesuits and Seminary-priests

were tried and executed. The conspirators were therefore the more confirmed in their resolution.

On the night of the 11th of December Catesby and his associates entered the house in Westminster, well supplied with mining tools, and with hard eggs and baked meats for their support. They commenced with mining the wall, three yards in thickness, which was between them and the parliament-house. Fawkes stood sentinel while the others wrought. Finding the work more severe than they had expected, they summoned Keyes from Lambeth, and also admitted Wright's brother Christopher into their association. The materials which they dug out during the day they spread over the garden at night; and not one of them ever went out of the house, or even into the upper part of it, lest they might be seen. They wrought without ceasing till Christmas-eve, when Fawkes brought them intelligence that parliament was farther prorogued till October. They therefore agreed to separate till after the holydays, when they should resume their labours.

During the month of January, 1605, Catesby admitted into the conspiracy Robert, the elder brother of Thomas Winter, John Grant of Norbrook, near Warwick, and an old servant of his own, named Thomas Bates. In February they renewed their operations in the mine, and had pierced half way through the wall, when suddenly, as we are assured, they were startled by the tolling of a bell within the wall under the parliament-house. They stopped and listened: Fawkes was called down, and he also heard it. On sprinkling the place, however, with holy water, the mysterious sound ceased, though it was frequently heard afterward: but the same remedy always proved efficacious, and it at length ceased altogether. One day they were alarmed by a rushing noise over their heads, and thought they were discovered: but Fawkes, on inquiry, found that it was made by a man of the name of Bright, who was selling off his coals from a cellar under the house of lords, in order to remove. They at once resolved to hire this cellar: for, in ad-

dition to the labour they had to encounter, they found the water now coming in on them. The cellar, also, was taken in Percy's name; twenty barrels of powder were conveyed to it from the house in Lambeth; in these their iron tools and large stones were put, in order to give greater efficacy to the explosion; the whole was then covered with billets and fagots, and lumber and empty bottles were scattered through the cellar. They now closed it up, placing marks within the door, that they might be able to ascertain if any one entered it during their absence. Having sent Fawkes to Flanders, to inform Sir William Stanley and other English officers of their project, and to endeavour to obtain foreign aid, they separated for the summer. In the autumn Sir Edmund Baynham was sent to Rome as the agent of the conspirators, with whose designs, it is probable, he had been made acquainted. It being necessary to have horses and arms prepared, Catesby pretended that he was commissioned to raise a troop of horse for the Spanish service; and he had thus a pretext for collecting arms, etc., at his own house and that of Grant. Several Catholic gentlemen having joined him as volunteers, he directed them to provide themselves with arms, and be ready when called upon. He and Percy now considered it necessary to associate with them some persons of wealth, in order to obtain the requisite funds; and they fixed on Sir Everard Digby of Rutlandshire, Ambrose Rookwood of Suffolk, and Francis Tresham of Northamptonshire. The first two, who were weak bigots, though virtuously disposed men, hesitated at first, but finally joined cordially in the project: the last, a man of indifferent character, was admitted solely on account of his wealth; and Catesby, it is said, had always a distrust of him.

Parliament having been appointed to meet on the 5th of November, the conspirators made their final arrangements accordingly. Fawkes was to fire the mine by means of a slow match, which would require a quarter of an hour to reach the powder; and, as soon as he had lighted it, he was to hasten and get on board

a small vessel which was ready in the river for that purpose, and carry the news over to Flanders. Digby was to collect the same day a number of the Catholic gentry, under the pretence of a hunting-party, at Dunchurch, in Warwickshire; and, as soon as they heard of the blow being struck, they were to send a detachment to seize the Princess Elizabeth, who was at Lord Harrington's, in that neighbourhood; and she was to be proclaimed queen in case Winter should fail in the part assigned him of securing one of her brothers.

There was one point on which they had not been agreed from the beginning, namely, how they should treat the Catholic nobles. Catesby, it would seem, had little scruple about destroying them with the rest, but the majority were in favour of sparing their friends and relations. Tresham, in particular, was most earnest to save his brothers-in-law, the lords Stourton and Mounteagle. It was finally agreed that, though no express notice should be given, various pretexts should be employed to induce their friends to stay away. This, however, did not satisfy Tresham; for, some days after, he urged on Catesby and Percy that information should be given to Lord Mounteagle; and, on their hesitating, he hinted that he should not advance the money he had promised, and proposed that the catastrophe should be postponed till the closing of parliament. His arguments, however, proved ineffectual.

On the 26th of October Lord Mounteagle went and supped at his house at Hoxton, where he had not been for a month before. At supper a letter was handed him by a page, who stated that he had received it from a strange man in the street. It was anonymous; and, by his lordship's direction, a gentleman named Ward read it aloud. It advised him to find some excuse for not attending parliament: "for God and man," it said, "hath concurred to punish the wickedness of this time," with sundry other mysterious hints. Lord Mounteagle took it that very evening to Lord Salisbury at Whitehall, who showed it to some other lords of the council; and it was decided that

nothing should be done till the king's return from Royston, where he was hunting.

It has been a matter much disputed who was the author of this letter. The most likely person by far was Tresham; nor is it improbable that he had previously given full information to Lord Mounteagle, and through him to the government, and that the letter was merely a device to conceal the real mode of discovery. Tresham was anxious also to save his confederates; and, but for their own infatuation, this might have been effected: for Winter was informed the next morning of this letter, and they could have escaped in the vessel prepared for Fawkes. On the 30th Tresham came from the country to London; and Catesby and Winter charged him with having written the letter, intending to poniard him if he should confess, or even hesitate: but he denied it with so much firmness, that they were, or affected to be, satisfied, and resolved to go on with their design.

The next day, the 31st, the king returned to London. A council was held the following day on the subject of the letter, and James himself is said to have divined its secret meaning.\* It was determined to search the cellar, but not till Monday the 4th. On that day the lord chamberlain, Lord Mounteagle, and others, went to the parliament-house. They found Fawkes in the cellar, but took no particular notice of him; the same night, however, Sir Thomas Knevet, a magistrate, was sent to the place with his assistants. He met Fawkes as he was stepping out of the door, and arrested him; and, on searching the cellar, thirty-six barrels of powder were discovered. Fawkes was brought before the council, where he openly avowed his design, and gloried in it, but refused to name his accomplices. He was then committed to the Tower.

Some of the conspirators had already left London, and others fled when they heard of the seizure of Fawkes. They proceeded with all speed to Ashby St. Leger's,

\* He might have done this, and yet Cecil have known the fact already.

where they found several of their friends, and thence they rode to Dunchurch to meet Digby and his party. Their dejected appearance told the whole story; and all who were not too deeply implicated departed forthwith to provide for their safety. Catesby and others, in the vain hope of resisting the Catholics of Wales and the adjoining counties, went to Norbrook, and thence to Huddington and Holbeach, a house of Stephen Littleton's. Their number was soon reduced by desertion to not more than sixty; the Catholic gentry, in the mean time, drove them with reproaches from their doors, and the common people merely gazed on them as they passed. At Holbeach, Digby and Stephen Littleton privately left them: but the former was seized at Dudley. As they were drying their powder, which had got wet with the rain, a burning coal fell into it, and Catesby and others were much injured. In the night Robert Winter stole away. The next day, the 8th, about noon, the sheriff arrived with the *posse comitatus*, and, surrounding the house, summoned them to surrender; which they refusing to do, he ordered an assault. Thomas Winter and the two Wrights were wounded; Catesby and Percy, placing themselves back to back, were shot through the body by two balls from the same musket; and the former died instantly, the latter not till the next day. Rookwood was also severely wounded, and the whole party were made prisoners. Robert Winter and Stephen Littleton, after concealing themselves for about two months, were at length betrayed by the cook at Hagley House, the residence of Mrs. Littleton, a widow lady.

The apprehension of Fawkes did not affect Tresham like the others. He appeared openly in the streets, and even went to the council and offered his services against the rebels. On the 12th, however, he was arrested and committed to the Tower. It is probable that the object of the council was to extract evidence from him against the Jesuits, and in this they partially succeeded: but, soon after his committal, he was attacked by a disease, of which he died on the 27th of

**December.** The Catholic writers ascribe his death to poison: but the fact that his wife and servant were with him during the whole of his illness would seem sufficient to confute this charge.

Fawkes was at first sullen, but on the 8th of November he made a full confession, except revealing the names of his associates, and these he disclosed the next day to Lord Salisbury. It is highly probable that, according to the barbarous custom of those times, the rack had been applied to him. On the 15th those taken at Holbeach reached London. They were all repeatedly examined, and, from facts confessed by them, especially by Bates, a proclamation was issued on the 16th of January, 1606, against the Jesuits Garnet, Greenway, and Gerard.

On the 27th, Sir Everard Digby, the two Winters, Fawkes, Grant, Rookwood, Keyes, and Bates, were brought to trial before a special commission, composed of privy counsellors and judges. The principal evidence against them was their own confessions, but there could not be a shadow of doubt respecting their guilt. Sentence of death was accordingly passed, and on the 30th, Digby, Robert Winter, Grant, and Bates were hanged and quartered, at the west end of St. Paul's churchyard. The next day Thomas Winter, Rookwood, Fawkes, and Keyes were also executed, opposite to the parliament-house.

The Jesuit Gerard escaped from Harwich to the Continent. Greenway disguised himself and came to London, where, as he was standing one day in a crowd, reading the proclamation, he was recognised by a person, who followed and arrested him. He affected to go with him willingly: but in a private street he eluded him, escaped into Essex, and at last got over to Flanders. Henry Garnet, the superior of the Jesuits in England, had concealed himself at Hendlip Hall, the seat of Mr. Abington, near Worcester. A hint, however, having been given that some Jesuits were concealed there, on the 20th of January the house was surrounded by Sir Henry Bromley: but so well contrived were the places of concealment, that it

was not till the eighth day that Garnet and another Jesuit, named Hall or Oldcorne, were discovered. They were brought up to London and committed to the Tower, where Garnet was treated with great mildness: but, in repeated examinations before the council, he would confess nothing. A practice not then uncommon, and which is still sometimes adopted, was then resorted to: Garnet and Oldcorne were told by their keeper that there was a concealed door between their cells, through which they might converse. Two persons were, in the mean time, so placed as to be able to hear what they said; and this led to important discoveries. It was Garnet's principle to deny, and that even with oaths and solemn asseverations, everything with which he was charged, until he found it useless to do so any longer. For this he had been justly, but perhaps too severely, blamed. It is a maxim of the law of England that no man is bound to be his own accuser:\* at the present day a prisoner is cautioned against replying to questions tending to implicate himself; and on his trial, by the general plea of "Not guilty," he in effect denies the whole charge against him. Garnet, in reality, did no more than this; fear of the torture (to which, however, he was never subjected) prevented his being silent; and his denial of the charges against him was the natural result of a desire not to be accessory to his own death.†

From Garnet's own admissions, and the testimony of others, it was proved that, in June, 1604, he learned from Catesby or Winter that there was a plot in hand; and that, in June of the following year, Catesby inquired of him respecting the lawfulness of destroying some innocent Catholics in a plan designed for the

\* "Nemo tenetur prodere seipsum" (*No one is bound to betray himself*).—*Magna Charta*.

† This may be good in law, but it is certainly very unsound in morals. And before a legal tribunal even, although the criminal is not required to confess his guilt, neither is he withheld from so doing; while a prompt and ingenuous acknowledgment of the truth is considered meritorious, and not unfrequently redounds to the prisoner's benefit, by inducing some mitigation of his punishment.—*Am. Ed.*



promotion of the Catholic religion, to which he gave an affirmative answer. Shortly after the whole plot was revealed to him by Greenway (not in confession, as he at first declared), and with whom he continued to converse from time to time respecting its progress. So many other convincing facts were made to appear, as to leave no reasonable doubt of Garnet's participation in the treason. He was tried on the 28th of March by a London jury, in presence of the Earl of Salisbury and other commissioners, and found guilty, and on the 3d of May he was hung in St. Paul's churchyard. By express order of the king, he was not cut down, for the farther execution of his sentence, until he was quite dead. He has been canonized by his church, and his name now stands in the list of her martyrs.

Perhaps, in the whole course of history, no instance more demonstrative of the baleful effects of wrong religious opinions on the mind and heart is to be found than this plot. A more horrible design was never conceived: yet those who engaged in it were mostly men of mild manners, correct lives, and independent fortunes; all, probably, sincerely believing that they were doing good service to God. "I am satisfied," said John Grant, on the day of his execution, "that our project was so far from being sinful, that I rely on my merits in bearing a part of that noble action as an abundant satisfaction and expiation for all sins committed by me during the rest of my life." "Nothing grieves me," said Robert Winter to Fawkes, "but that there is not an apology made by some to justify our doing in this business; but our deaths will be a sufficient justification of it, and it is for God's cause." It is said by Greenway, that, as Rookwood was drawn to execution, his wife stood at an open window in the Strand, comforting him and telling him "to be of good courage, inasmuch as he suffered for a great and noble cause." Of the truth of this, however, there seems good reason to doubt, since fear alone would probably have prevented her from giving utterance to such expressions.

The English Catholics, it is well known, were divided into two almost hostile parties, the Jesuited and that of the secular priests. The conspirators were all of the former party, and the latter, who had been utterly ignorant of the plot, were unanimous, loud, and, we doubt not, sincere in the abhorrence which they expressed at it. Digby, in a letter to his lady, laments to find that the cause for which he had sacrificed everything was disapproved of by Catholics and their priests ; and that the act which brought him to his death should be thought by them a great sin. But these innocent Catholics, nevertheless, had their share in the penalty, for a new and more severe penal code was enacted. The lords Montague, Mordaunt, and Stourton were fined and imprisoned for their suspicious absence from parliament. The Earl of Northumberland was compelled to pay £30,000, was deprived of his offices, and adjudged to remain for life a prisoner in the Tower.

A favourite object of the king, ever since his accession, had been the effecting of a union (a legislative one, it would appear) between his two kingdoms. The plan was submitted to the parliaments of both countries, but national prejudices and jealousies were too strong to permit so desirable a measure then to be effected ; and all that could be obtained was the abolition of the laws by which each treated the other as strangers and enemies, and a decision of the English judges, declaring the *postnati*, or Scots born since the king's accession, to be natural subjects of the King of England.

During the six succeeding years of James's reign (that is, from 1607 to 1612), little occurred to disturb the national tranquillity, though the king and the house of commons were constantly at variance : he straining every nerve to obtain money unconditionally, and they struggling to secure, in return, an abolition of wardship, purveyance, and other feudal oppressions. The king, in the mean time, was chiefly occupied with his hunting and his writing ; while the task of supplying his lavish expenditure fell to Salis-

bury, now, as was his father, lord-treasurer: but with a very different sovereign, and a far more refractory parliament to manage. His health, in consequence, appears to have given way under strong mental excitement, and he died at Marlborough on the 24th of May, 1612, as he was returning from Bath, where he had been to use the waters. His character was that of a sagacious, prudent statesman: but he wanted the high principles and honourable feelings of his father. "He was," says Bacon, "a more fit man to keep things from getting worse, but no very fit man to reduce things to be better."

Towards the close of the year 1612, the king and country were deprived of the heir-apparent, Prince Henry. His death, however, caused little grief to James, who looked on him rather as a rival than as a son; while the prince, on his part, made no secret of the contempt in which he held his father, whose character was in every respect the opposite of his own. Henry was zealous in his attachment to the Reformed faith;\* he abstained from expensive and immoral pleasures, and delighted in athletic and martial exercises. When, one day, the French ambassador came to take leave of him, he found him handling the pike. "Tell your king," said the prince, "how you left me engaged." He greatly admired Sir Walter Raleigh. "Sure no king but my father," he used to say, "would keep such a bird in a cage." He died on the 6th of

\* The Puritans had great hopes from this prince; the following rhymes were current among the people:

"Henry the Eighth pulled down abbeys and cells,  
But Henry the Ninth shall pull down bishops and bells."†

---

† That this young prince was of a highly promising character, there can be no doubt. His mind was decidedly inclined to religious seriousness, and among his other virtuous qualities is mentioned his deep abhorrence of profane swearing; a vice which he never yielded to himself, and would not suffer in those around him. He adopted the following expedient to discourage this odious habit among the members of his household. All profanity was strictly forbidden, and for every violation of this rule a fine was exacted. The money thus collected was deposited in a box which he had placed for that purpose at each of the three palaces where at different times he resided, and was distributed to the poor.—*Am. Ed.*

November, in the 18th year of his age, of a fever brought on by excessive and injudicious exercise. His death was, of course, imputed by the people to poison, and the Earl of Rochester, the royal favourite, was the person charged with having administered it; while some even suspected the king himself, how unjustly we need not say.\*

The death of Prince Henry was a subject of general regret, and it is a curious question how far it was a misfortune or otherwise to the nation. It might have been that, had he come to the throne, animated as he was by a martial spirit, he would have entered vigorously into the defence of the Elector Palatine and the prosecution of a war with Spain; and that, to obtain supplies from parliament, he would, like the great Edwards, have made the needful concessions in favour of liberty, and that thus the civil war would have been averted. But it was not in this manner that the liberties of England were to be secured: they were destined to pass through the fire of civil discord.

James, with his habitual aversion to gloom, forbade any one to approach him in mourning: he would not even allow the preparations for the Christmas revels to be interrupted; and, in the following February, 1613, he celebrated, with more than ordinary splendour, the nuptials of his only daughter Elizabeth, with Frederic, count palatine of the Rhine. The princess was only in her sixteenth year.

A lady of high rank was at this time paying the penalty of her proximity to the throne. Arabella Stuart had, though expressly forbidden by the king, given her hand in secret to Sir William Seymour, son of Lord Beauchamp.† As both were descended from Henry VII., the king's jealousy took alarm, and Sey-

\* Of the real cause of his death there cannot be the slightest doubt; yet Dr. Vaughan tries to insinuate the guilt of the favourite, and, as it would appear, even of the king.

† Lord Beauchamp was the son of Lord Hertford and Lady Catharine Grey (see above, page 25). Alliance with the blood royal was fatal to this family.

mour was committed to the Tower, and his wife to the house of Sir Thomas Parry, at Lambeth. They were, however, permitted by their keepers to have secret interviews, and the king, in consequence, ordered that Lady Arabella should be removed to Durham. She refused to leave her chamber, and was taken out of it by force. James, however, allowed her to remain a month at Highgate for her health. While there she disguised herself in man's attire, rode to Blackwall, and went down the river to where a French bark lay ready, and got on board. Seymour, in the mean time, in the garb of a physician, had made his way out of the Tower, and entered a boat which was to convey him to the bark: but the French captain, fearing to wait, set sail without him, in spite of his wife's entreaties. Seymour got over to Flanders in a collier: but the bark was taken off the Nore, and Arabella was immured in the Tower. To her petitions for liberty James replied, that she must pay the forfeit of her disobedience. The harsh treatment which she experienced deprived her of reason, and she died in the fourth year of her confinement, the victim of that odious policy of state which, on the plea of self-preservation, tramples on all the principles of nature and justice. It is remarkable that Lady Arabella's husband was afterward, as Marquis of Hertford, one of the most devoted adherents of the son of her persecutor.

## CHAPTER II.

## JAMES I. (CONTINUED).

1613-1625.

Somerset and Lady Essex.—Sir Walter Raleigh.—The Elector Palatine.—Fall of Bacon.—The Spanish Match.—Prince of Wales in Spain.—Breach with the Court of Spain.—Death and Character of James.—Affairs of Ireland; of Scotland.—State of Religion.—Book of Sports.

It is time that we should proceed to notice a remarkable feature in the character of this feeble monarch—his favouritism. To this failing he had been addicted from his earliest days; and it is rather curious that he, the most slovenly of men in his own person, should have been as fastidious as was even the late queen in regard to the looks and dress of those who were about him. A few years previous to the time of which we now write, on the occasion of a tilting-match, Lord Hay, one of the Scottish nobles, had selected a youth of the border family of the Kerrs for his equerry. Robert Kerr or Carr was now about twenty years of age, tall and handsome, and but just returned from his travels. It was his office to present his lord's shield and device to the king; and, as he was about to perform it, his horse became suddenly unruly, and threw him. His leg was broken in the fall; and James, affected by his youth and beauty, had him removed to a room in the palace, where he visited him after the tilt. The visits were frequently renewed, and the young man gradually won the heart of the king, who resolved to make him a scholar, a statesman, and a man of wealth and rank. The last was easy; and, to effect the former, he himself became his tutor in Latin and his lecturer in politics. So long as Salisbury lived, the favourite, though laden with wealth and raised to the dignity of Viscount

Rochester, took no part in affairs of state : but, after the death of that minister, the duties of his offices were devolved for some time on the new viscount. Rochester, from the outset of his career, had the good sense to select an able adviser in the person of Sir Thomas Overbury : a man of talent and judgment, but ambitious, insolent, and little encumbered with scruples. His prudence, however, kept his patron's bark steady before the wind ; and his voyage might have been prosperous to the end, had it not struck on the rock of illicit love.\*

The young Earl of Essex, as we have seen, had been restored in honour and estate at the king's accession ; and Salisbury, whose eldest son had been married to a daughter of the Earl of Suffolk, in order to increase his influence by family connexion, proposed a match between her sister, the Lady Frances, and young Essex. No objections being made, the marriage took place, the bridegroom being fourteen years of age, and the bride his junior by a year. Immediately after the ceremony, the young husband was sent to travel on the Continent, while the bride was committed to the care of her mother, who, instead of keeping her in the seclusion appropriate to her situation, adorned her with the showy accomplishments of the age, and took her to court. Here her beauty and her graces became the subject of general admiration ; and Prince Henry, even, is said to have cast an eye of favour on the lovely young countess : but Rochester, by the aid of letters composed for him by Overbury, succeeded in winning her heart.

When Essex, therefore, returned, at the age of eighteen, and claimed his privileges, he was received by his lady with distaste and aversion ; and a separation from him and a marriage with Rochester were now the objects of her wishes ; while the viscount was equally eager with herself for the union.

When Rochester informed Overbury of his design,

\* The chief authority for the history of Somerset and the Countess of Essex is a pamphlet named "Truth brought to Light." Implicit reliance cannot, however, be placed on its statements.

the latter, who saw in it nothing but evil to his patron and ruin to himself, remonstrated in the strongest terms. He dwelt on the infamy of the countess's character, the odium and hazard of the attempt to obtain a divorce, and finally threatened to abandon him if he persisted in his project. All this Rochester forthwith communicated to the countess. In her rage she offered £1000 to a knight named Sir David Wood, whom Overbury had injured, to assassinate him. Wood refused; and Rochester then prevailed on the king to appoint Overbury his envoy to France or Russia. This office, however, at Rochester's secret instigation, he declined, saying that the king could not, in law or justice, send him into exile. For this contempt, as it was termed, he was committed to the Tower, where, after a confinement of about six months, he died suddenly.

Meanwhile the business of the divorce was proceeded with. The king, to his disgrace, took a warm interest in it; and Essex was, for some cause or other, induced to make such admissions as afforded a pretext to seven out of twelve of a court of delegates to yield to the wishes of the king, and pronounce a sentence of separation. Shortly after the countess and Rochester were married: James, that she might not lose in rank, having previously created him Earl of Somerset. The ceremony was performed in the royal chapel, in presence of the king and queen, with extraordinary magnificence. The bride had the effrontery to appear in the virgin costume of the day, her hair hanging in curls down to her waist. It may be that the king was not aware of the infamy of the parties. The favourite, however, had lately given him £25,000 to relieve his necessities; and he hoped, by this union, to set him on good terms with the father and uncle of the bride.

The vengeance of Heaven, though often delayed, is not on that account the less sure; and the crimes of this guilty pair were destined to come to light. The qualities by which Somerset had won the royal favour soon began to decay: his youthful bloom was fast fading, for conscience dimmed its lustre. Another ob-



ject, too, had interested the fickle affections of the king. George, one of the sons of Sir George Villiers, of Brookesby, in Leicestershire, a tall, handsome youth of about one-and-twenty, who had travelled a little, and spent a short time at the court of France, and whose taste in dress was exquisite, appeared at court; and the impression he made on the king's mind was at once perceptible, by his appointing him to the office of cup-bearer. The enemies of Somerset now conceived the idea of setting up Villiers as his rival: but James had formed a cunning plan, of taking no one to his favour unless specially recommended by the queen; "that, if she should complain afterward of the *dear one*, he might make answer, It is long of yourself, for you commended him unto me." The task of gaining the queen was committed to Archbishop Abbot; and, after long refusing, she consented, with these prophetic words: "My lord, you know not what you desire. If Villiers gain the royal favour, we shall all be sufferers; I shall not be spared more than others; the king will teach him to treat us all with pride and contempt." Forthwith, on the 24th of April, 1615, Villiers was sworn a gentleman of the privy chamber, and knighted. The king wished the two favourites to live in harmony: but Somerset haughtily spurned the advances of Villiers, and the court was soon divided into two parties.

Reports were now rife that Overbury had not come fairly by his end; and circumstances brought the guilt of it so near to the earl and countess, that James directed Chief-justice Coke to make out a warrant for their committal. The king's hypocrisy on this occasion is almost incredible. Somerset took leave of him at Royston to go up to London, on Friday, the 1st of August, promising to return on Monday. James, as usual, hung about his neck, and even wept, declaring he should neither eat nor drink till he saw him again, adding, "For God's sake, give thy lady this kiss for me." Yet the earl was scarcely in his coach before the king said, "Now the deil gae with thee, for I will never see thy face mair."

A dreadful tissue of iniquity was now speedily unravelled. It appeared that the countess had long been intimate with a Mrs. Turner, the widow of a physician, a woman of infamous character, and was by her made acquainted with one Dr. Forman, a pretended conjurer, who assisted her in her criminal plans; and that Mrs. Turner had recommended one Weston, who had been her husband's bailiff, as a fit person for their designs on Overbury, while Sir Gervase Elways, the lieutenant of the Tower, a creature of Somerset's, was made to appoint him to attend on the prisoner. Northampton also, the abettor of his niece's depravity, assuring Elways that what was to be done had the king's approbation, engaged him to wink at the attempts that Weston might make on the prisoner's life. The course adopted was to mingle slow poisons with Overbury's food: but, these not succeeding, Weston gave him a poisonous mixture which had the desired effect. He was buried immediately, Northampton averring to the king that he died of disorders occasioned by his vices. Some time after, the apothecary's boy who had assisted Weston in giving the mixture, being at Flushing, talked freely of the matter; and his information being conveyed to Sir Ralph Winwood, the secretary of state, inquiry was set on foot by the king, and all the suspected persons were arrested. Weston made an ample confession; and he, one Franklin, and Mrs. Turner,\* were executed at Tyburn, and Elways on Tower Hill. The countess, when arraigned, pleaded guilty; Somerset, who was perhaps innocent,† de-

\* This wretched woman had introduced a kind of yellow starch for stiffening ruffs, bands, etc. Bishop Warburton says she wore a yellow ruff at her execution: but one who was present (Goodman's Court of James I., ii., 146) says she expressed a "detestation of painted pride, malice, powdered hair, *yellow bands*, and the rest of the wardrobe of court vanities." According to Sir Simon D'Ewes, the hangman wore yellow bands and cuffs, of course in derision of the criminal. Yellow starch went out of fashion for a few years.

† Dr. Lingard appears to believe in the innocence of Somerset. He also, we think, sufficiently accounts for the anxiety of James to prevail on him to confess, without, like Dr. Vaughan, attempting to fix an odious imputation on the royal character.

fended himself stoutly for the space of eleven hours, but he was found guilty by his peers, July 11th, 1616. The king granted a pardon to the countess; the execution of the earl's sentence was suspended, and, some years after, it was reversed. They were allowed to retire to the country, with an allowance of £4000 a year, where they lived in misery, hating and shunning each other. The countess died of a loathsome disease, it is said, in 1632, but the earl lived till 1645.

Shortly after these trials, Sir Edward Coke, the chief justice, who had given offence by his conduct on them, and his vigorous maintenance of the authority of the law of the land against the encroachments of the prerogative, was dismissed from his high office. In effecting this, the arts of Sir Francis Bacon, the attorney-general and his rival, were of great efficacy. This extraordinary man, who united the noblest genius with the meanest soul, who was the first philosopher and statesman, and, at the same time, one of the most servile flatterers of his age, was made, on the death of Lord Ellesmere, lord-keeper, and afterward chancellor, and he thus attained the summit of his ambition.

Sir Walter Raleigh was now at liberty, for the new favourite had been induced to exert his interest in his behalf; and he was liberated, after a confinement of thirteen years. But he was poor; his property had been seized at the time he was condemned; and the manor of Sherbourn, which, before the death of Queen Elizabeth, he had conveyed to his eldest son, was also lost: for a single word had been omitted in the deed of conveyance, and this omission was held to invalidate it. Lady Raleigh and her children threw themselves at the feet of the monarch, imploring him not to deprive them of their only support: but his unfeeling reply was, "I mun ha' the land, I mun ha' it for Carr:" for this minion had, as the phrase then was, *begged* it. James, however, gave her, by way of compensation, £8000 for what was said to be worth £5000 a year.

It will be recollected that Raleigh had already made

an unsuccessful voyage to Guiana. His imagination still ran on the gold-mines which he fancied that region to contain; even while in prison he had kept alive his claims to it, by sending out small expeditions; and he now proposed to fit out one more considerable, at the expense of himself and his friends, the king to receive the usual fifth of the gold and silver that should be thence imported. The avarice of James was tempted: but he had long had an anxious desire to unite his house in marriage with the royal line of Spain, whom he therefore feared to offend, and who, he knew, hated and dreaded Raleigh. Moreover, Gondomar, the Spanish resident, had, by his wit and his adroit flattery, gained a most undue influence over the royal mind. The moment he heard of the rumoured expedition, he remonstrated with the king. James assured him that he would not give Raleigh a pardon, so that his former sentence would still hang over him; and that, if he should make any attack on the Spanish settlements, he would either have him executed, or deliver him up on his return. Gondomar affected to be satisfied: he learned also from James all the particulars of the expedition, which he transmitted to Spain; and directions were accordingly sent out to the Spaniards in Guiana to oppose Raleigh when he should arrive.

After a delay of nearly a year, Raleigh sailed from Plymouth in 1617 with fourteen vessels. Misfortunes befell him from the very outset: two of his ships parted from him; and a number of his men perished by a contagious disease, which brought himself to death's door. At length, in November, he reached the mouth of the Orinoco, up which river he sent five of his vessels, each containing fifty men, under Captain Kemys, who professed to have discovered the mine in one of the former voyages, giving him strict orders not to molest the Spaniards: for it is to be observed, that, since Raleigh had been last there, and taken possession of the country in the name of his sovereign, the Spaniards had settled there, and built a small town named St. Thomas. As the English passed this place they were attacked in the night: but they repelled the

assailants, pursued them to the town, and took it. In the action Raleigh's eldest son and the Spanish governor, a near kinsman of Gondomar's, were slain. They then proceeded up the river in search of the mine, but to no purpose; and, having suffered severely from an ambuscade of the Spaniards, they returned to Raleigh, who, aware of the full extent of the mischief that had been done, reproached Kemys so bitterly with his conduct that he retired to his cabin and put an end to his life. Raleigh was soon compelled to return home by a mutiny among his men, and arrived at Plymouth in the beginning of July, 1618. The king was greatly exasperated; Gondomar claimed, and was promised vengeance; and a proclamation was issued against Raleigh. This he learned at Kinsale, in Ireland; and yet he proceeded to Plymouth, and was on his way to London, when he was arrested by his kinsman, Sir Lewis Stukeley. It is the statement of Raleigh's son, that the earls of Arundel and Pembroke were bound to the king for his return; and that, to free them from this engagement, he thus surrendered himself. But, so soon as he had exonerated them, he considered himself justified in making his escape if he could: accident or treachery, however, foiled all his attempts, and he was once more consigned to the Tower. He was now subjected to various examinations; and to Sir Thomas Wilson, keeper of the state papers, a man of more learning and talent than honour or virtue, was committed the odious office of endeavouring, under the aspect of mildness and sympathy, to draw from him a confession of treasonable intercourse with the French agent. In this, however, he failed, as the prisoner was perfectly innocent on that head.

About the middle of October a letter arrived from the King of Spain, expressing his wish that Raleigh should be executed in England rather than given up to him. Accordingly, a privy seal was directed to the judges of the king's bench, commanding them to proceed to execution against Sir Walter Raleigh, under his former sentence. When the prisoner was required to show cause against it, he submitted that his

majesty's commission, giving him power of life or death over others, amounted to a pardon. This plea was overruled by the chief justice; execution was granted; and, on the 29th of October, the aged warrior was conducted to a scaffold in Old Palace Yard. There were present several of the nobility: Sir Walter spoke with his usual calmness and courage, clearing himself from all the charges made against him. Respecting the Earl of Essex, his words were, "I take God to witness I had no hand in his blood, and was none of those that procured his death. I shed tears for him when he died." When the Dean of Westminster asked him in what faith he meant to die, he said, "In the faith professed by the Church of England, and that he hoped to be saved, and have his sins washed away by the precious blood and merits of our Saviour Christ." After he had put off his gown and doublet, he asked the executioner to let him see the axe. He poised it, and, running his thumb along the edge, said, with a smile, "This is a sharp medicine, but it will cure all diseases." The executioner offering to blindfold him, he refused, saying, "Think you I fear the shadow of the axe, when I fear not the axe itself?" He gave the signal by stretching out his hands, and his head was struck off in two blows. "Every man," says a witness, "who saw Sir Walter Raleigh die, said it was impossible to show more decorum, courage, or piety; and that his death would do more hurt to the faction that sought it than ever his life could have done."

Sir Walter Raleigh died in the sixty-sixth year of his age. In his character were united the warrior, the statesman, the courtier, and the man of letters and science. Were it not that his imagination occasionally predominated over his judgment, he might have easily been the first man of his age. His death is an indelible stain on the character of the king, who betrayed him to the Spaniards, and then put him to death\* after he had virtually pardoned him, and on a

\* Marriage treaties with Spain seemed to require the cement of innocent blood. Witness Warwick and Raleigh.

charge, too, of which he must have known him to be innocent. The panegyrists of the contemptible monarch (Hume in the van) have sought to blacken the character of his victim : but their calumnies have been amply refuted;\* and, with all his faults, Sir Walter Raleigh is to be numbered among England's most illustrious sons.

The queen, who had vainly tried to interest the favourite for Raleigh, died early in the following year, 1619. In the very same year a crown was offered to her son-in-law. The privileges which had been secured by imperial edicts to the Bohemian Protestants having been violated by the Emperor Matthias, they had recourse to arms ; and, on his death, refused to acknowledge his successor, Ferdinand of Austria, as king of Bohemia. They offered the crown to the Elector of Saxony ; and, on his refusal, to the Elector Palatine, who imprudently accepted it, and was crowned on the 4th of November at Prague. His father-in-law, though ignorant of the Bohemian constitution (by which the crown was elective), at once pronounced the Bohemians rebels, and ordered him to resign the crown : but the people of England exulted at the prospect offered of an increase of strength to the Protestant cause, and were urgent with the king to aid the elector in his contest with the house of Austria. James was now sadly hampered between his love of peace, his high notions of the divine rights of kings, and his anxiety to procure an infant for his son on the one hand, and his family feeling and the clamours of his subjects on the other. He had recourse to the usual refuge of weak minds, a middle course : he mediated and negotiated, and allowed Sir Horace Vere to raise a regiment of 2400 men for the defence of the palatinate. But all was in vain : a decisive defeat under the

\* See Cayley and Tytler. Mr. Hallam seems to think ill of Raleigh, but without giving his reasons. This able writer has, however, what appears to us an unfair habit of judging the men of the sixteenth by the maxims of the nineteenth century, and a kind of prejudice against Elizabeth and her great men, Essex (perhaps the least great) excepted.

walls of Prague, on the 4th of November, 1620, deprived the elector of his crown; and his hereditary dominions were rapidly conquered by Spinola, the general of the King of Spain. He and his family retired to the Hague, where they lived in poverty; and King James, to the end of his life, was occupied in fruitless negotiations for the restoration of the palatinate.

The affairs of the palatinate, and the expense caused by them, obliged the king to call a parliament in 1621. One of the first matters to which the commons turned their attention was the old grievance of monopolies; and the practice of impeachment was revived. Sir Giles Monpesson (who had patents for the manufacture of gold and silver thread, and for licensing inns and alehouses, in which he and his agent, Sir Francis Mitchell, had been guilty of great fraud and oppression) was the first object of attack. Monpesson escaped to the Continent; but the lords condemned both him and Mitchell to be fined and imprisoned, and to lose their knighthood. A far higher head than these, however, was to be abased by this parliament. Articles of impeachment were exhibited, on the 21st of March, against the Viscount of St. Alban's (as Bacon was now styled), for bribery and corruption in his high office of chancellor. From his bed, to which he had taken, he wrote to the lords confessing the truth of the charges. He was sentenced to pay a fine of £40,000, to be imprisoned during pleasure, and to be incapacitated from approaching the court, sitting in parliament, or holding any office of dignity or profit. The king remitted the fine, and gave him his liberty; and the remaining five years of his life were chiefly occupied with abject efforts to recover the royal favour. In his defence it was alleged, that it had long been the usage for the chancellor to accept presents from suiters: but it was replied that no precedents could justify so pernicious a practice. The unanimity with which he was condemned, and his not daring to make a defence, would seem to intimate that he had far outgone his predecessors. Yet Bacon was not an avaricious man: it was his love of show, his want of economy,



and his easiness to his servants and dependants, that obliged him to have recourse to all modes of obtaining money. It is also said that he could have defended himself: but that, as his defence would have contained disclosures of matters which the king wished to remain unknown, promises were made him to induce him to refrain from that course.

The session terminated in a quarrel between the king and the commons. They drew up a petition praying him to engage vigorously in the defence of the palatine; to make war on Spain; to marry his son to a Protestant princess; and to enforce the laws against papists. On obtaining a copy of the petition, he expressed the utmost indignation; and wrote to the speaker, complaining of the "fiery, popular, and turbulent spirits" in the house, who presumed to meddle with mysteries of state, things beyond their capacity. The house, in reply, intimated that they were entitled to interpose in matters relating to the dignity and safety of the throne and kingdom. Their liberty of speech was, they said, their ancient and undoubted right, an inheritance transmitted from their ancestors. When the approach of the committee with this address was notified to James, he ordered twelve chairs to be brought, for so many kings, he said, were coming. In his answer, he wished they had rather said that their privileges were derived from the grace and permission of his ancestors and himself: for most of them had grown from precedent, which rather shows toleration than inheritance. If, however, they did not encroach on the prerogative, he assured them he would be careful to maintain their lawful liberties and privileges. This produced a memorable protestation on the part of the commons, asserting that their privileges were their birthright and inheritance; that affairs of state are proper subjects of counsel and debate in parliament; and that the members have a right to freedom of speech, and should not be molested for anything said or done in the house, except by censure of the house itself. The king tore this protest with his own hands from the journals, and published his reasons for

so doing. He dissolved the parliament forthwith, committed some of the most prominent members to prison, and sent others on a commission to Ireland, by way of punishment.

The Spanish match was the object nearest to James's heart. Philip III. had kept the matter hanging for years in the hope of obtaining conditions which might lead to the re-establishment of popery in England. On his death in 1622, James hoped that with the young king, Philip IV., a more speedy arrangement might be effected; and he sent the able and experienced Lord Digby (soon after Earl of Bristol), who had been already three times his minister at Madrid, once more ambassador to Spain. He also despatched an envoy to the pope; and he at the same time relaxed the penal laws, discharging a great number of recusants from prison. Philip, who was evidently sincere, exerted himself to procure a dispensation at Rome; and James and his son subscribed the religious articles respecting the infanta, after they had been seen and corrected at the Vatican. They also pledged themselves that the persecution against the Catholics should cease if they would only perform their worship in private houses. Everything seemed now arranged, when a romantic adventure of the prince disconcerted the whole project.

Villiers, who was now Marquis of Buckingham, was haughty and insolent, but open and sincere; a zealous friend and a violent enemy; utterly devoted to prudence, and incapable of restraining his passions. In the heyday of his favour, he had not hesitated to let the Prince of Wales taste of his insolence; and that prince, who was of a cold, proud, reserved temper, felt the insult deeply, and testified his displeasure in strong terms. A gleam of prudence, however, probably suggested to Buckingham that, as the king was growing old, and he was himself a young man, his situation might not be an enviable one under the successor, unless he should previously appease him. He therefore bent all his endeavours to effect this object, and succeeded so completely, that he soon stood even higher

with the prince than with the king, who was now rather weary of his insolence.

Buckingham now took an opportunity of remarking to the prince how slowly the treaty for his marriage went on, and how much it might be accelerated by his own presence at the court of Madrid, by which advantages respecting the palatinate and other matters might also be obtained. The prince's imagination was kindled; and Buckingham then proposed that they two, with a few attendants, should travel in disguise to Madrid. Charles gave a ready consent, threw himself on his knees before his father, and, having made a previous condition that he would not consult with any one on what he was going to request, craved his permission to undertake the journey. Buckingham, who was present, backed the suit, and the king gave a reluctant consent.

But, when James was left to himself, and had time to reflect calmly on the matter, he saw it in its true form of absurdity and danger, both to the person of the prince and to his own reputation; and, when they came to him the next day for their despatches, he began to explain to them the various cogent reasons which had made him resolve to retract his consent. The prince remonstrated with dutiful submission and shedding of tears: but Buckingham, who had been accustomed to deal with him in a different way, told him that no one in future would believe anything he said; that he had, contrary to his promise, revealed the matter to some rascal who had furnished him with these pitiful reasons, but that he would find out who this counsellor was; and that the prince could never forget his disappointment, nor forgive the author of it. The weak monarch, thus bullied, renewed his consent; and it was agreed that Sir Francis Cottington, the prince's secretary, and Edwin Porter, a gentleman of his bed-chamber (both of whom were acquainted with Spain), should accompany them. Cottington was forthwith sent for. "He will be opposed to the journey," whispered Buckingham to the prince. "He dares not," was the reply. When he came, the king having told

him that he was going to be intrusted with a secret which he must not reveal to any one, added, "Here is baby Charles and Steeny,\* who have a great mind to go post into Spain and fetch home the infanta. They will have but two more in their company, and have chosen you for one. What think you of the journey?" Cottington urged sundry objections; when the king threw himself on his bed, weeping and crying, "I told you this before," and lamenting and exclaiming that he was undone, and should lose baby Charles. Buckingham fell to reviling and threatening Cottington; but the king said, "Nay, Steeny, you are much to blame for using him so. He answered me directly to the question I asked him, and very honestly and wisely; and yet you know he said no more than I told you before he was called in."†

All ended, however, in the king's renewing his consent. The prince and marquis went, on the 17th of February, 1623, to a house belonging to the latter in Essex; whence, attended by his master of the horse, Sir Richard Graham, and furnished with false beards and periwigs, they proceeded to Dover, where they were joined by Cottington and Porter. Under the assumed names of Jack and Tom Smith, they passed over to Boulogne and proceeded to Paris, where they stopped one day and saw the king, the queen-mother, and the Princess Henrietta at dinner, and again at a masked ball to which they were admitted in the evening. They travelled rapidly through France; and, on the evening of the 7th of March, they reached Madrid, having left their attendants a day's journey behind. They went straight to Bristol's house; and the prince stayed

\* These were James's familiar names for the prince and Buckingham. He called the latter Steeny, from a fancied resemblance between his countenance and that of St. Stephen, in the pictures of that saint. James used to style himself their *dad*; and Buckingham seems to have termed himself the *dog* of the royal family, for as such he subscribes himself in his letters to the king; and the queen addresses him as "My kind Dogge," in her letter requesting him to intercede for Raleigh.

† See Clarendon (i., 30), who had the account from Cottington himself.

in the street while Buckingham went in, bearing the portmanteau. Bristol is said to have evinced little surprise at their appearance, having already had some suspicion of their design from conversations with Gondomar, who appears to have been the real author of the project, which he suggested to Buckingham. The next day, the arrival of the prince being notified at court, he was waited on by the prime minister, the Count-duke of Olivarez, and in the evening the king in person came to visit him. Nothing could exceed the respect with which he was treated: the king everywhere gave him precedence: he was presented, after the Spanish manner, with two golden keys to the royal apartments; the council were ordered to obey him; the prisons were thrown open, and all sumptuary laws were suspended.

Our limits do not permit of entering into the details of the prince's abode in Spain. Numbers of the English nobility repaired thither to attend the son of their king; and though for some time he was not given access to the infanta, and could only get a sight of her at a distance, the negotiation for the marriage was proceeded in with good faith by the Spanish court. They were not, however, without hopes of his conversion. The pope himself wrote to him; and the reply of Charles was conceived in such terms as must have given good hopes of a change of his faith:\* yet Charles was at no time given to change in religion or anything else, and we fear that we must view his conduct on this occasion as an instance of the duplicity and insincerity which characterized him through life. The pontiff added some new articles to the dispensation: the most important of which was, that the children should be educated by their mother till they were ten years of age. Thus amended, they were transmitted to London, and assented to by the king

\* "The letter to the pope is by your favour more than compliment; which I never saw before, and may be a warning that nothing is to be done or said in that nice argument but what will endure the light." It is thus that Clarendon writes of it to Secretary Nicholas.—Clarendon State Papers, ii. 337.

and council: James also swore privately to other articles for tolerating the Catholics. But the death of the pontiff at this time occasioned new delays, and Buckingham had resolved to break off the match. He regarded Bristol as his political rival, and was jealous of the consideration with which he was treated. He had also had several quarrels with Olivarez; while the Spaniards, on the other hand, were disgusted with his shameless profligacy, his arrogant temper, and the want of respect and decorum in his conduct towards the prince. He was likewise anxious to return to the English court, where he found that he had more enemies than he suspected.

Under pretext of the new delay, James was induced to send an order for the return of the prince. It was farther arranged that a proxy should be left with Bristol, to be delivered after the arrival of the dispensation; that the espousals should take place before Christmas, and that the prince should be represented by Philip himself, or his brother Don Carlos. The infanta took the title of Princess of England, and a suitable court was formed for her. Buckingham, as lord-high-admiral, having gone before to see that the fleet was ready, Charles now took a solemn leave of the queen and the infanta: Philip accompanied him on his way as far as the Escorial, and they parted as brothers. Several of the Spanish grandees attended Charles to St. Andero, where he embarked; and, on the 5th of October, he landed safely at Portsmouth, to the great joy of the king and nation.

The dispensation was received from Rome on the 12th of November, and Philip appointed the 29th for the espousals, and the 9th of December for the marriage. The nobility were invited to attend, and the towns and cities in Spain were commanded to make public rejoicings, when couriers suddenly arrived from England, ordering Lord Bristol not to deliver the proxy, to prepare to return to England, and to declare to the Spanish king that James would proceed with the marriage only on the condition of his pledging himself to take up arms in defence of the palatinate.

Philip justly complained of the indignity thus offered him; the orders for the marriage were recalled; and the infanta, with tears, laid down her new title. Bristol, on his return, was ordered to remain at his country-seat and to consider himself a prisoner; and thus at once fell the edifice which James had been so many years erecting.

In all this it is easy to discern the influence of Buckingham: but the Spaniards were the dupes of their own artifices. They had protracted the negotiations for years, in the hope of extorting the most favourable terms possible for the Catholic religion in England.

With the large dower of the Spanish princess, James had hoped to relieve his pecuniary embarrassments: but that hope being gone, no resource remained but to summon a parliament. To this measure, when urged by the prince and Buckingham, he gave an unwilling consent; and when parliament met, on the 24th of February, 1624, he addressed it, submitting the late negotiations and all other matters to its consideration. On the subject of religion, he required them to judge him charitably as they would be judged, adding that he had certainly, on sundry occasions, relaxed the severity of the penal laws; but as to dispensing with or altering them, "I never," he declared, "promised nor yielded; I never thought it with my heart nor spoke it with my mouth." This daring falsehood he uttered in the presence of his son and Buckingham, who well knew his oath to the secret articles of the marriage treaty!

A few days after, Buckingham addressed the two houses, the prince standing by to prompt him, and vouch for the truth of what he said. By the aid of downright falsehoods, misrepresentations, and garbled extracts of despatches, he made out, to the satisfaction of those who were glad of any pretext for a quarrel with Spain, that the Spanish court had been insincere from first to last in the negotiation. An address was voted, requesting the king to break off all treaties with the court of Madrid; Buckingham became a

universal favourite ; and bonfires and public rejoicings testified the delight of the people at the prospect of a war with the papists. The king gave a reluctant consent to the war, and the commons voted a sum of £300,000 for carrying it on, which, at the king's own desire, was to be paid into the hands of treasurers appointed by themselves.

Cranborne, earl of Middlesex, lord-treasurer, was now impeached for bribery and other misdemeanours. He was a citizen of London, who had risen chiefly through the favour of Buckingham : but he had, of late, incurred his displeasure, and the patron and the prince now urged on his impeachment. The king, who saw farther into matters than either of them, told the duke that he was a fool, and was cutting a rod for his own back, and the prince that he would live to have his fill of impeachments :\* but they heeded him not, and Middlesex was found guilty by the lords.

Towards the end of this year a treaty of marriage was effected between the Prince of Wales and the Princess Henrietta Maria, sister of the King of France. Unhappily for the house of Stuart, one of the articles was, that the queen should have the education of the children till they were thirteen years of age. James and his son, heedless of their late oaths† and protestations, also agreed to articles which nearly amounted to a toleration of the Catholic religion.

The king thus at length succeeded in his darling object of obtaining a high match for his son : but he was not fated to witness the marriage. He died on the 27th of March in the following year, 1625, after a fortnight's illness. His disorder was said to be tertian ague and gout in the stomach. He met his end with great constancy and devotion,‡ charging his son

\* Clarendon, i., 41.

† Charles had, a few months before, bound himself by oath, "That, whensoever it should please God to bestow upon him any lady that were popish, she should have no farther liberty but for her own family, and no advantage to the recusants at home."—*Journal of Commons*, 756. Lingard, ix., 219.

‡ When the historian speaks of such a man as James finding  
VOL. III.—Q



to be steadfast in his religion, and not to desert his sister and her children.

The character of this monarch was a strange mixture of sense and folly. On perusing his writings, one cannot fail to be struck with the shrewdness, sagacity, and good sense which they exhibit: yet ever and anon something occurs to prove that the author was not a wise man. It was, however, in his actions that James's folly most signally displayed itself; and here he forfeits all claim to respect. Wisdom in conduct is never, we think, to be found where moral courage is wanting; and this last usually requires physical courage for its support. In this James was notoriously deficient; and hence nothing great, and but little good, can be recorded of him. His treatment of Arabella Stuart was cowardly and cruel; that of Raleigh unjust and pusillanimous; and in the case of the Somersets he behaved most disgracefully. In his habits James was filthy; he drank to excess, and he swore and blasphemed in an odious manner. In a word, with all his learning and talents, it would be difficult to find a monarch less entitled to respect than James I.

The court of James was licentious and profligate to an extreme degree; and, if we may believe the ac-

"peace in death," and taking to himself in his last moments the consoling assurance of acceptance with God and future happiness, we can scarcely credit the relation. And still it was probably so; for instances of like infatuation are constantly occurring in the history of individuals whose lives we find stained with every crime, and of whom it is nevertheless gravely recorded that they met their end full of Christian hope and comfort. There is surely nothing in the principles or doctrines of the Christian faith to encourage such egregious self-delusion; and that it is so frequently indulged, in the absence of all that is virtuous and good, is to be accounted for only by the facility with which the most profligate can deceive themselves as to their true character, and accommodate their religious views to any moral standard, however degraded and false. As to James, he had not been inattentive to the outward forms of religion, notwithstanding the profligacy of his life; and he no doubt relied on this, in connexion with a vague faith in certain religious views, to make good his account in another world.—*Am. Ed.*

counts of the time, it was not uncommon for the court-ladies to appear in public in a state of intoxication. The whole story of the Somersets presents a deplorable picture of aulic depravity. At the same time, the royal palace was frequently the scene of great magnificence; and those stately masques, where Ben Jonson supplied the poetry, and Inigo Jones the machinery, far exceeded in costliness and splendour the court entertainments of succeeding times.

The history of the reign of James, indeed, is rather the history of his court than of the nation. The most important national event in the whole course is that of the colonization of the north of Ireland, which we will now briefly relate.

On the suppression of the rebellion of the Desmonds in the late reign, their immense territories had become forfeit to the crown. A plan of colonization was adopted, and the lands were parcelled out among the undertakers (as they were named) at low rents. The grants, however, were too large, and the conditions were not duly complied with: so that, though Munster thus received a large accession of English blood (the stock of its nobility and gentry of the present day), the experiment failed. After the accession of James, the great northern chieftains O'Neal and O'Donnel fled to Spain, and their territories, amounting to half a million of acres, fell to the crown. The king and Iacon then devised a system of colonization, which was carried into effect by Sir Arthur Chichester, the lord-deputy. There were to be three classes of grants, of 2000, 1500, and 1000 acres. Those who obtained the first were to build a castle and a *bawn* or strong courtyard; the next, a house of stone or brick and a bawn; and the third, a bawn only. They were all bound to settle on their lands, in certain proportions, able-bodied men of English or Lowland-Scottish birth, who were to live in villages, and not dispersedly. A portion of this territory was also granted to the native Irish. The plan was a noble one; and though, like everything designed for the benefit of that unfortunate country, the cupidity and in-

justice of those who sought to profit by oppressing the natives, prevented its fully attaining its object, it has, nevertheless, been productive of great and permanent good ; and what was formerly the wildest and most barbarous part of Ireland, is now the best cultivated, and in industry and civilization approaches the nearest to England.

In the fifteenth year of his reign, 1617, the king revisited his native realm. The chief objects of this visit were to extend his powers in matters of religion, and to approximate more closely the churches of England and Scotland. Between the avidity of the great lords, who had robbed the church of its landed property without shame or remorse, the levelling system of the Reformed preachers, and the feebleness of the crown, the ancient system of church government in this latter country had been unable to keep its ground. Episcopacy had been abolished, and another form, called Presbytery, established in its place. But man is still man under all forms ; and the assumptions of immunity from civil jurisdiction put forth by Melville, Black, and others, having led to a tumult in Edinburgh, in which the person of the king was exposed to some risk, the parliament was induced to pass a law establishing the authority of the crown over the clergy ; and James even prevailed in obtaining the consent of the clergy to his appointment of fifty-one of their number to titular prelacies, who were to sit in parliament as representatives of the church. It was in this state of things in Scotland that James succeeded to the crown of England.

In 1606, an act of the legislature restored to the bishops a part of their revenues ; they were some time after made perpetual moderators of the provincial synods ; and they finally, in 1610, regained all their original powers, the rights of ordination and spiritual jurisdiction being vested in them. When the king visited Scotland in 1617, he required that certain of the rites of the Church of England should be adopted, such as kneeling at the eucharist, administering it to persons on their deathbeds, and the practice of

**Episcopal confirmation.** These were rejected by the first ecclesiastical assembly: but, in the following year, means were found for securing their reception, and thus the Scottish clergy were brought into a partial and reluctant agreement with a church which they regarded with the deepest aversion.

The state of religion in England during this reign was far from being satisfactory. After the death of Archbishop Whitgift in 1603, the king conferred the primacy on Bancroft, bishop of London, a prelate distinguished by his zeal against Presbytery and Puritanism. The Puritan ministers were subjected to the persecution of being silenced, disgraced, and imprisoned while Bancroft lived: but his successor, Abbot, was a much better man, and had a leaning even towards their opinions; so that, under him, they were rather favoured than otherwise.

Hitherto the Protestants generally had held most of the opinions which are termed Calvinistic, especially in relation to predestination, or the absolute decrees of the Deity, as explained in the writings of St. Augustine: but, about this time, the opposite doctrines of the Greek fathers were promulgated in Holland by Arminius, from whom they afterward took their name. James, who had been reared in Calvinistic sentiments, was highly incensed when Vorstius, who held Arminian opinions, was appointed to a professorship at Leyden. To propitiate him, the States were obliged to deprive and banish their new professor, the king at the same time hinting that they might as well have committed him to the flames. Yet James himself, and a portion of the prelates and clergy, afterward adopted the Arminian tenets. It is not a little curious, that those who thus became the most strenuous asserters of the freedom of man's will, should be also the stoutest upholders of the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience.\*

\* The following anecdote is well known: "On the day of the dissolution of the last parliament of King James I., Mr. Waller, out of curiosity or respect, went to see the king at dinner, with

The liberties of England are so much indebted to the Puritans, that we feel little disposed to dwell on their errors : but historical truth requires that their character should be fairly represented. In piety and correct moral conduct they were, on the whole, superior to their opponents ; but then they were harsh, inquisitorial, and censorious, and, to a fault, scrupulous about trifles. The persecution of them by the government was of a character calculated rather to annoy and irritate than to suppress, and the publication of the "Book of Sports" did much more harm than good. The following was the occasion of it. The Puritans had been gradually converting the Lord's Day into a day of rest and devotion, and of abstinence from all worldly pleasures and pursuits. The Catholics, who made it, in part, a day of recreation and amusement, took occasion to censure the Reformed religion for this gloom and moroseness, as they called it, and the king and his clerical advisers thinking differently from the Puritans on the subject, a proclamation was issued, forbidding any one preventing the people from having, after divine service, dancing, archery, leaping, vaulting, and other sports, as also May-poles, May-games, Whitsun-ales, and morris-dances. Bull-baiting, bear-baiting, interludes, and bowls, were prohibited. No recusant, however, was to avail himself of this liberty, which was allowed to

whom were Dr. Andrews, the bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Neal, bishop of Durham, standing behind his majesty's chair. There happened something very extraordinary in the conversation these prelates had with the king, on which Mr. Waller did often reflect. His majesty asked the bishops, 'My lords, cannot I take my subjects' money when I want it, without all this formality in parliament?' The Bishop of Durham readily answered, 'God forbid, sir, but you should ; you are the breath of our nostrils.' Whereupon the king turned and said to the Bishop of Winchester, 'Well, my lord, what say you?' 'Sir,' replied the bishop, 'I have no skill to judge of parliamentary cases.' The king answered, 'No put-offs, my lord.' 'Then, sir,' said he, 'I think it is lawful for you to take my brother Neal's money, for he offers it.' Mr. Waller said the company was pleased with this answer, and the wit of it seemed to affect the king."—*Life of Waller, prefixed to his poems.*

those only who had attended divine service in the Established Church on that day. The "Book of Sports," as it was called, was prepared with reference to these circumstances, and was ordered to be read aloud in the churches. But primate Abbot forbade it to be read in his presence at Croydon, and it merely afforded to the Puritans an occasion for representing their opponents as being totally devoid of religion.\*

The houses of commons during this reign were deeply imbued with the puritanical spirit: a most convincing proof of its prevalence throughout the nation. Hence it was that, with their zeal for repressing the abuses of the prerogative, and securing the liberties of the people, were joined an anxiety for the suppression of the Catholics, and a continued effort to extend the rigid principles of their own party.

\* It is needless to say, that the views of the Puritans as to the strict religious observance of the Sabbath are essentially agreed in by Protestants generally of the present day, at least in Great Britain and our own country, as being most in conformity with the divine requirement and the intended purposes of the day; though in Catholic countries, and in those where the Greek religion is predominant, different views still prevail, and Sunday is regarded and treated, so much of it as is not actually employed in religious worship, as a day of amusement.—*Am. Ed.*

## CHAPTER III.

CHARLES I.\*

1625-1629.

King's Marriage.—First Parliament.—Expedition to Cadiz.—Impeachment of Buckingham.—Arbitrary Taxation.—War with France.—Expedition to Rochelle.—Petition of Right.—Murder of Buckingham.—Sir Thomas Wentworth.—Third Parliament.—Harsh Treatment of Sir John Eliot.

THE new monarch, now in the twenty-fifth year of his age, offered, in his morals and character, a favourable contrast to his father. He was grave and serious in his deportment, regular in his conduct, an enemy to licentiousness and riot of every kind, and a lover and patron of the fine arts.† He had, however, imbibed to the fullest extent his father's absurd notions of the divine rights of kings, and their accountability to God alone for the discharge of the duties of their high office. All attempts to limit his authority he regarded as usurpation and rebellion; and, as we shall see, he held that any concessions extorted from the monarch were revocable by him at pleasure, as being contrary to his duty to God to grant. Charles was sincerely attached to the episcopal form of government in the church. To his misfortune, he was also blindly devoted to the insolent, rapacious, self-willed, domineering upstart, whom the folly of his father had gorged with wealth and offices,‡ and made ruler of himself and his kingdom.

\* The principal authorities for the reign of Charles are, Clarendon, Whitlock, and Rushworth.

† See Mrs. Hutchinson's *Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, p. 65, 4to edit.

‡ He was lord-high-admiral of England and Ireland, warden of the Cinque Ports, master of the horse, justice in eyre of the forests and chases this side the Trent, constable of Windsor Castle,

The first care of Charles was to celebrate his marriage with the Princess Henrietta Maria. The nuptials were performed on the 1st of May, by proxy, at Paris, whither the Duke of Buckingham repaired with a splendid train, to conduct the young queen to England. The king met her at Dover, and took her thence to Hampton Court, as the plague was raging in London.

On the 18th of June, Charles's first parliament met at Westminster. The king submitted to it the state of his finances: he was encumbered by a debt of his father's to a large amount; he had all the expenses of his marriage and other charges to meet; and he was on the point of being engaged in a war against the whole house of Austria. To meet all these demands, "the house of commons," Hume sarcastically observes, "conducted by the wisest and ablest senators that had ever flourished in England, thought proper to confer on the king a supply of two subsidies, amounting to £112,000 (\$537,000)!" Such conduct appears to be, at first sight, as that partial writer represents it, little better than unfeeling mockery of the confiding young monarch. When carefully examined, however, it will appear, perhaps, in a different light; and for this purpose we will take a brief view of the composition of the two houses of parliament.

During the whole of the Tudor period we have seen the house of lords the abject instruments of the will of the crown, to whose bounty they had been indebted for their wealth and honours. But nearly a century's undisturbed possession of the monastic lands had inspired many of them with a feeling of security and independence; and, as they gazed on the venerable turrets of Wilton, Woburn, and the other abbeys and priories which now formed their abodes, they caught a portion of the spirit which had animated the

knight of the garter, &c., &c. The wealth that had been heaped upon him is almost past computation. Some one cited by Mrs. Hutchinson said beautifully and correctly of him, "He seemed as an unhappy exhalation drawn up from the earth, not only to cloud the setting, but the rising sun."



barons of other days, whose memory these stately piles recalled. Their honours, too, had no less acquired the sanction of time; and they viewed with disdain the dignities of the upstart Buckingham, whose pride, insolence, and rapacity sorely galled their feelings. An opposition to the crown, composed of such individuals and of the maintainers of the Puritan doctrines, now appeared in the lords; and its strength may be estimated by the fact that the Earl of Pembroke, its head, was the holder of ten proxies: only three less than those of Buckingham, the dispenser of wealth and favour.\*

In the commons there were the two parties essential to a popular assembly in a monarchy—the supporters of the crown and its measures, and the opponents of abuses and advocates for the rights and privileges of the subject: that is, the court party and the country party. The former were a minority, and they felt, therefore, the necessity of proceeding with caution, extenuating and softening rather than defending abuses. The latter were mostly Puritans: zealous against all that appeared to them superstitious in religion, hostile to the exorbitant powers exercised by the prelates, and probably, in many instances, secretly inclined to the Presbyterian form:† but, at the same time, sincerely anxious for the national rights and liberties. There were other members, again (subsequently known by the name of *patriots*), who were more anxious for civil liberty than for any change of religious ceremonies, and who did not view with particular dislike either the cope and surplice or the wedding-ring. Such were Sir Edward Coke, Sir Thomas Cotton, John Selden, John Pym, and others.

\* It was shortly afterward resolved, that no peer should hold more than two, which continues to be the rule. This practice, by-the-way, supposes either a superlative degree of wisdom, or an unreasoning spirit of party in peers, who thus vote on all questions without having heard the arguments either for or against them.

† That there was such a spirit abroad is evident from the demands made at the Hampton-Court conference. See above, p. 146.

Puritans and patriots were alike animated by zeal against popery : the inveterate foe, as they considered, of both mental and civil liberty. Toleration, it may be remarked, was at that time unknown.

One of the first proceedings of the commons was to require every member to receive the sacrament in St. Margaret's church, and thus to testify his attachment to the Protestant religion : for there was now a regular establishment of Capuchin friars at Somerset House, the residence of the queen, and these men boldly paraded the streets in their habits ; the Jesuits and other priests also began to show themselves openly in various places, and the court was known to be full of Catholics. The commons next petitioned the king to enforce the laws against recusants. Dr. Montague, one of the court divines, having published a work called "*Appello Cæsarem*" (*I appeal to Cæsar*), recommending the Catholics to the favour of the government, and representing the Puritans as desiring anarchy, and therefore to be discouraged, was summoned to answer for it at the bar of the house of commons. The Arminians exerted themselves in his favour, and the king declared that he was one of his chaplains : but all availed not ; and he was forced to give security to answer the charge of contempt of the house, and of impugning the articles of the Church of England.

The chief object of the king was to obtain an immediate supply of money : but the commons wished to couple with it a redress of grievances. They saw that the king was a mere puppet in the hands of Buckingham ; and they now began to have their doubts of the justice of the war with Spain, into which he was about to plunge the nation. They were loath to vote a large sum without conditions, and still they could not, with a good grace, refuse supplies. They therefore adopted a middle course, and voted two subsidies (both amounting to about £140,000) for immediate use ; they also, instead of voting, as had long been customary, the duties of tonnage and poundage to the king for life, granted them only for a single year.

The lords, however, rejected this bill ; and, at the request of the two houses, on account of the plague, there was an adjournment for three weeks, when they were to meet at Oxford.

In the interim the parliament was made acquainted with the following circumstance. King James had promised the French king to aid him with a loan of eight armed vessels, to be employed against Spain in the Mediterranean. These ships, under Admiral Pennington, came to Dieppe ; and there the crews suspected, or rather discovered, that they were to be employed against the Huguenots of Rochelle. They forthwith drew up a *round robin*,\* and laid it under the admiral's Prayer-book ; and Pennington, declaring that he would rather be hanged for disobedience in England than fight against his fellow-Protestants in France, returned to the Downs. Buckingham, by false representations, induced them to return to France : but when they found that they had been a second time deceived, with the exception of one gunner, they all abandoned their vessels, which were taken possession of by the French, and employed against Rochelle.

This information did not much prepossess the commons in favour of the king and Buckingham. They therefore still talked of a redress of grievances as preliminary to a supply ; and put sundry questions to the duke, asking, among other things, if he had not broken off the match with Spain out of spleen to Olivarez, and whether he had not made that with France on still less favourable terms ? They were even in train to impeach him : when the king, to save his favourite, dissolved the parliament, contrary to the advice of his privy council.

It is usual, with the advocates of Charles, to make it a heavy charge against the parliament that they had involved him in a war with Spain, and then refused the necessary supplies : but war had not yet been declared, and Charles was under no necessity of enter-

\* A round robin is a paper signed by names written in a circle to prevent the first signatures from being known, which are generally those of the leaders.—*Am. Ed.*

ing into it. Urged on, however, by his own passions or by those of Buckingham, he was determined on a war with that monarchy. To make a show of his Protestant zeal, he issued, in violation of his engagements at his marriage, a proclamation, enforcing the laws against recusants; to raise money, he levied tonnage and poundage at the ports, though the bill for it had not passed; he sent also privy-seals to the nobility and gentry, and suspended the payment of all fees and salaries. Ships and troops had, in the mean time, been assembled at Plymouth; and, in the month of October, a fleet of ninety sail, carrying ten thousand soldiers, put to sea. Buckingham had given the command of this armament to Sir Edward Cecil, now Lord Wimbledon, a man advanced in years, who had long been in the Dutch service, but who was generally held to be incompetent. Cadiz was the point fixed on for attack: but no council of war was held till they were in sight of the port, and time was thus given to the shipping to escape, which might easily have been captured had they entered the harbour at once. The troops, however, landed, and marched rapidly to secure the bridge leading from the isle on which Cadiz stands to the mainland. But the soldiers, meeting on their way with cellars full of wine, got drunk and unruly; and their timid leader re-embarked them, notwithstanding that no enemy had as yet appeared. He then sailed to intercept the Plate-fleet, but it passed him in the night; and, on the 8th of December, he returned to Plymouth, after losing more than one thousand men by disease. The council instituted an inquiry: but, after many examinations of Wimbledon and his officers, they judged it best to bury the affair in silence.

The failure of this project was a heavy blow to the king. Had it succeeded, and had he got the plunder of Cadiz and the Plate-fleet, he would have been, in some measure, independent of his parliament: but now he had rashly plunged into a war; and, without the aid of the commons, he had no means of extricating himself. He had, moreover, pledged his word to

VOL. III.—R

call a parliament after Christmas. All, therefore, that could be done, was to try to break the strength of the opposition. Pembroke was induced to seek a reconciliation with Buckingham; and the great seal was taken from Bishop Williams, whom Buckingham feared, and committed to Sir Thomas Coventry. In order to exclude Coke and six others, most hostile to the favourite, from the house of commons, the king himself inserted their names in the list of sheriffs for the ensuing year: at the same time, new proclamations were issued against the recusants, to convince the nation of the monarch's zeal for religion.

The king was crowned on Candlemas-day, 1626; and, four days after, the 6th of February, the parliament met. They appointed a committee on religion, one on grievances, and one on evils generally, to consider their causes and remedies.

The progress of their inquiries was by no means pleasing to the king. He reminded them of his wants, and they promised three subsidies and three fifteenths if a favourable answer were given to their prayer for the redress of grievances. The king advised them to hasten the supply: else, said he, "it will be worse for yourselves; for if any evil happen, I think I shall be the last that shall feel it." The commons promised obedience: but, ere they proceeded in the matter, they came to a resolution of impeaching the favourite, as the main cause of the evils for which they sought redress. Buckingham had now also a formidable foe in the lords. The Earl of Bristol wrote to the peers, complaining that his writ of summons had been withheld. On this notice of it, the king directed that the writ should be issued: but, at the same time, he wrote to Bristol, ordering him not to avail himself of it. Bristol sent this letter to the house, asking their advice on the subject, and claiming permission to appear and accuse his enemy of high crimes and misdemeanours. Forthwith the attorney-general, by order of the king and Buckingham, charged Bristol himself with high treason. The lords resolved to hear both parties, giving precedence to the last, but deciding, at the

same time, that the charge against the earl should not impeach his testimony.

The allegations against Bristol chiefly rested on the testimony of the king himself. Against this, as an injurious precedent, the earl very properly remonstrated. Their intrinsic weakness, however, was such, that he was able easily to refute them, but to the charges which he made against the duke no reply was given. He accused him of having conspired with Gondomar to draw the prince to Spain, that he might there be induced to change his religion; of having, while there, disgraced his country by his indecent and licentious conduct; of having broken off the treaty because the Spanish council refused to treat with him; and of having, on his return, deceived the king and parliament.

The commons, having voted that "common fame is a good ground of proceedings for that house," sent up to the lords forthwith an impeachment against the duke. The managers of it were Sir Dudley Digges, Sir John Eliot, John Selden, John Pym, and four other members. They charged him with the purchase and sale of offices; with procuring titles and pensions for his kindred and allies; with furnishing the ships to be employed against Rochelle; with embezzling the king's money, and obtaining grants of the crown lands; and with having given plasters and potions to the late king in his sickness, etc. The king, asserting himself to be implicated by Digges and Eliot in the terms employed by them in urging this last charge, committed them both to the Tower. The commons, on this, refusing to proceed with any business till their members were released, Sir Dudley Carleton had the imprudence to remind them how, in other countries, kings, finding parliaments to turn liberty to license, took away and abolished them; "and now," said he, "the common people, wanting good food, look more like ghosts than men, and go in canvass cloth and wooden shoes." For this he narrowly escaped being compelled to ask pardon on his knees. Digges and Eliot, having denied or explained what was laid to their charge,

were set at liberty. The duke now made a plausible defence, drawn up for him by Sir Nicholas Hyde, an eminent lawyer; and the king, effectually to screen him, on the 15th of June dissolved the parliament, though the supplies had not been voted. To the prayer of the lords for a short delay, he replied, "No, not of one minute;" and in a "Declaration" which he issued, he stated "that in this, as in all his other royal actions, he is not bound to give an account to any but to God alone, whose immediate vicegerent he is." The earls of Arundel and Bristol, as the duke's enemies, were both placed in confinement.

Charles had at this time family dissensions likewise to annoy him. The young queen was completely under the influence of her priests and servants. The former had actually made her walk on foot in penance to Tyburn, the scene of the death of so many martyrs in the Catholic cause; and they gave great offence by appearing publicly, on this occasion, in their habits. The latter induced her to abandon the study of English; and furnished her, moreover, with pretexts for quarrelling with the king. After a good deal of difficulty and opposition, Charles succeeded at length in clearing his palace and kingdom of these mischievous people. A new household was now formed for the queen, who gradually got the better of her ill humour, and she soon acquired a fatal influence over the mind of her husband.

The king now saw plainly that parliament would grant supplies only on the condition of a redress of grievances; and, as he was resolved not to be dictated to by them, he proceeded to raise money without their aid. He continued to levy tonnage and poundage, though they had not been granted; the crown lands were made, by leases and other means, more productive; the fines on recusants were more rigidly exacted; and privy-seals were again issued. The seaports were required to supply, and maintain for three months, a certain number of armed vessels; and the lords-lieutenant of the counties had directions to muster and train the people to arms, as invasion was apprehend-

ed. An attempt was also made to prevail on the people to pay the subsidies voted by parliament: but in London, Middlesex, and Kent, which were first applied to, the proposition was indignantly rejected. A new plan was then adopted: a loan to the amount of three subsidies (£200,000—\$960,000) was demanded, each person to give according to the rate at which he was assessed in the last subsidy. The clergy were instructed "to stir up all sorts of people to express their zeal to God and their duty to the king" in this matter; and the commissioners of the loan were directed to deal with each individual separately, to insist on the required sum, to examine him on oath respecting his motives and advisers if he declined, and to furnish the privy council with the names of those who should persist in refusing.

This arbitrary mode of taxation was enforced by the most despotic measures. Inferior people, who refused to lend what was not likely ever to be repaid, were impressed, and sent to serve in the army or navy; and the gentry were called before the council, and several of them committed to prison. Five of these, Sir Thomas Darnel, John Corbet, Walter Earl, John Heveningham, and Everard Hampden, applied to the Court of King's Bench for their writ of *habeas corpus*, and the writ was granted, but the warden of the Fleet made return that the warrant of the privy-council assigned no particular cause for their imprisonment. The case, therefore, came to be argued, on the 7th of November, before the court over which Sir Nicholas Hyde now presided. Noy, Selden, and other eminent lawyers appeared for the prisoners; while Heath, the attorney-general, supported the pretensions of the crown. The former argued, from the article of Magna Charta, that "no freeman shall be taken or imprisoned unless by lawful judgment of his peers or the law of the land," and the repeated assertions of this same principle, quoting precedents of the admission to bail of persons committed by the council during the Tudor period. Heath replied on high prerogative principles, alluding to the king's absolute power, and arguing from the



legal maxim, "the king can do no wrong," that a sufficient cause must have existed, though it was not set forth; and contended that the precedents cited on the other side did not apply to the present case. The court decided in favour of the crown. "The consequence of this decision," an able writer observes,\* "was, that every statute, from the time of Magna Charta, designed to protect the personal liberties of Englishmen, became a dead letter; since the insertion of four words in a warrant (*per speciale mandatum regis—by special command of the king*), which might become matter of form, would control their remedial efficacy."

The Protestant cause had sustained great reverses in Germany, and the allies there of the English king were now in pressing need of his assistance. His evil genius, Buckingham, had also engaged him in a war with France. This worthless, insolent minion, as we have seen, had been sent over to conduct Henrietta Maria to England. He there presumed to make love to the young queen Anne of Austria, but found he had a rival in Cardinal Richelieu himself; and when, after setting out with his fair charge, he privately returned to Paris, he received a hint that, if he persisted in his design, he would be assassinated. "He swore in the instant that he would see and speak with that lady in spite of the strength and power of France," and he did see and speak with her in a brief interview, but he never could obtain permission to return to the French court. Revenge now actuated him: he sought to alienate the king from the queen, and behaved to her himself with the greatest rudeness and insolence. Something, for example, having occurred to prevent her from calling on his mother at an appointed hour, he came to her in high dudgeon, and, among other rude expressions, told her "she should repent it." The queen replying with some quickness, he added that "there had been queens in England who had lost their heads." By provoking and insulting the French

\* Hallam, i., 529.

court in various ways, he sought, though in vain, to draw it into a declaration of war.\* He then resolved to commence hostilities himself. Soubise, one of the principal Huguenot leaders, came over to England to concert measures ; and a fleet and army were assembled at Portsmouth.

On the 27th of June, 1627, the duke made sail for Rochelle, with one hundred ships, carrying about seven thousand soldiers. The gates of that town, however, were shut against him, the people alleging that they could not act without the consent of the other members of their union (who were now at peace with the crown) : but they agreed to furnish supplies if the English would remain in the neighbourhood. For this purpose it was necessary to take possession of the Isle of Rhe or that of Oleron : the latter near Rochelle, well supplied with oil, wine, etc., and feebly garrisoned ; the other more distant, and defended by a citadel and a strong garrison. Buckingham proposed to attack Oleron : but, while Soubise was gone to consult the people of the town, he landed on the 12th of July in the Isle of Rhe. The garrison opposed him gallantly, but were forced to retire. Instead of attacking the fort at once, he passed five days in inaction ; and, in the interval, fresh troops came over to the isle, and the fort was strengthened. At length he advanced against it : but committing one error after another, he at last, on the 29th of October, raised the siege and commenced his retreat. The route lay partly along a narrow causeway or mound, with salt-pits on each side. The French seized the moment for attack when a part of the English troops were on the causeway - the cavalry were driven among the foot and trampled them down, and numbers were forced into the pits and drowned. The loss of the English was about two thousand men. Buckingham is said to have shown great personal courage on this occasion, but this is the praise of a mere soldier rather than of a general, and entitles him to little commendation.

\* Clarendon, i., 67-69.

The French Protestants had been induced, by the solicitations of the English court, to take up arms against their king. Rochelle was menaced by the royal arms, and the people implored Charles to aid them. This he engaged to do in the strongest terms, binding himself never to abandon them. A new expedition was accordingly planned; and, when the question arose how the money was to be raised, some of the council proposed the legal mode of summoning a parliament. To this the king with much reluctance\* assented, and writs were issued. Sundry irregular methods of raising money were, however, previously tried: but all proving of no avail, the king once more met the grand council of the nation on the 17th of March, 1628.

The primate, who had been suspended for refusing to license one of the political sermons in favour of the forced loan,† Bishop Williams, whom Buckingham had caused to be sent to the Tower, and the Earl of Bristol, who had been charged with treason, were permitted to take their seats in the upper house. The gentlemen (seventy-eight in number) who were imprisoned for refusing the forced loan were set at liberty, and were all returned for various places. "Never before," says Lingard, "had parliament assembled under auspices more favourable to the cause of freedom.

\* Some time before, "at the council table, some proposing a parliament, the king said *he did abominate the name.*"—*Mede, Letter*, Sept. 30, 1626.

† One Sibthorpe preached a sermon enforcing passive obedience. If the commands of the prince, he said, were against the laws of God or nature, or impossible, the subject was not, as in all other cases, bound to active obedience: but he was bound to passive obedience, that is, "to undergo the punishment, without either resistance, or railing, or reviling." The king commanded the primate to license this sermon himself (not in the ordinary way, by one of his chaplains). Abbot, on reading it, refused, and was suspended; when Laud, Bishop of London, licensed it forthwith. At this time also, Dr. Mainwaring, one of the royal chaplains, preached two sermons at court, maintaining that the king is not bound to obey the laws; that he may impose what taxes he pleases, and that all are bound to pay them, under pain of everlasting condemnation.

The sense of the nation had been loudly proclaimed by the elections, which had generally fallen on persons distinguished by their recent opposition to the court; it was the interest of the lords to co-operate with men who sought the protection of private property and personal liberty; and the same necessity which had compelled the king to summon a parliament, placed him, without resource, at the mercy of his subjects."

But Charles would not or could not see this. He addressed them in high terms, telling them plainly that it was only as a means for obtaining money that he had called them together; and that, if they did not do their duty by granting it, "he must, in discharge of his conscience, use those other means which God had put into his hands, to save that which the follies of other men may otherwise hazard to lose. Take not this," he added, "as threatening (I scorn to threaten any but my equals); but as an admonition from him that, both out of nature and duty, hath most care of your preservations and prosperities."

The commons manifested no offence at this haughty language, and they voted a supply of five subsidies, to be paid within a twelvemonth. But, when the king thought to grasp the prize, he was met by demands, his assent to which was declared a necessary preliminary to the passing of a bill granting the supplies. Four resolutions had been passed unanimously, viz., 1. No freeman shall be imprisoned without a lawful cause expressed. 2. The writ of *habeas corpus* shall be granted in all cases. 3. If the return assign no cause, he shall be delivered or bailed. 4. No tax or loan shall be levied by the king without an act of parliament.\* At a conference with the peers, the case

\* The following remarks, made by one of the members, will show the kind of spirit which animated the commons at this period. "I have read," said Sir Robert Philips, "of a custom among the old Romans, that once every year they held a solemn festival, during which their slaves had liberty, without exception, to speak what they would to ease their afflicted minds; and that, on the conclusion of the festival, they returned to their former abject con-

was argued by Selden, Coke, and others on the one side, and by the crown lawyers on the other. The lords made some amendments, which were, however, rejected by the commons. During two months Charles had recourse to every expedient to escape the necessity of parting with his arbitrary power. At length, on the 28th of May, his assent was solicited to the celebrated "Petition of Right." This stated, 1. That freemen had been required to lend money to the king, and, on refusing, had been molested with oaths, arrests, etc. 2. That persons thus arrested, without any cause being assigned, had been remanded when brought up by writ of *habeas corpus*. 3. That soldiers had been billeted in private houses, to the great grievance of the inhabitants. 4. That soldiers and sailors were tried for imputed offences by martial law, and not by the law of the land. It prayed that all such proceedings should cease, "as being contrary to the rights and liberties of the subject, and the laws and statutes of the nation." Charles determined to dissemble. In a few days, on the 2d of June, he came to give his royal assent to the bill which had been framed from the petition: but, instead of the usual brief *Soit droit fait comme il est désiré* (*Let it be straightway done as is desired*), it was long and ambiguous. The commons were now filled with grief and despair; but their spirit soon revived, and they were on the point of voting Buckingham "the grievance of grievances." The danger of his favourite shook the resolution of the monarch; and he gave his assent to the bill in the usual manner, amid loud acclamations of applause. The subsidy bills were now speedily passed, but they were followed by a remonstrance, imputing all the late national calamities and losses to Buckingham, and praying for his removal from court. It was also declared that tonnage and poundage depended on the consent of parliament.

dition. This may, with some resemblance and distinction, well set forth our present state. After the revolution of some time, and the grievous sufferings of many violent oppressions, we have now, as those slaves had, a day of liberty of speech: but we shall not, I trust, be hereafter slaves, for we are *born free*."—*Am. Ed.*

The king, having obtained the money he wanted, resolved on a prorogation ; and on the 26th, while the clerk of the commons was reading the bill of tonnage and poundage, they were summoned to meet the king. He told them that by assenting to the Petition of Right he had granted no new liberties, but merely confirmed the ancient ones ; that tonnage and poundage were what he could not do without ; " and that it was never intended," he said, " by you to ask, and never meant, I am sure, by me to grant." He gave the royal assent to the subsidy bills, and then prorogued the parliament.

It is with sincere pleasure that we quote the following observations of Lingard: " Thus ended," says he, " this eventful session, one of the most memorable in our history. The patriots may have been occasionally intemperate in their warmth and extravagant in their predictions, but their labours have entitled them to the gratitude of posterity. They extorted from the king the recognition of the rights which he had so wantonly violated, and fixed on a firm and permanent basis the liberties of the nation. It is indeed true that these liberties were subsequently invaded ; that again and again they were trampled in the dust : but the Petition of Right survived to bear evidence against the encroachments of the prerogative. To it the people always appealed, to it the crown was ultimately compelled to submit." It was, in effect, a second Magna Charta.\*

The king was not long in giving proof of his insincerity. The Petition of Right had been printed for circulation at the desire of both houses, when, by his orders, the impression was cancelled, and a new one issued, with his *first* answer to it. " By which expedient," says Hume, " he endeavoured to persuade the people that he had nowise receded from his former claims and pretensions."

\* As our limits do not allow of our narrating the parliamentary details, we here give the names of the leading patriots. They were Sir John Eliot, Sir Edward Coke, Sir Robert Philips, Sel-den, Glanvil, Noy, and Pym

Rochelle was at this time hard pressed by the royal forces, commanded by Richelieu in person, and a fleet and army had been collected at Portsmouth, of which Buckingham was again to take the command. But this time he was to negotiate, not to fight : since both Charles and Louis were satisfied that, by their hostility, they were only strengthening the house of Austria. One morning (the 23d of August) the duke had some high words in his chamber with Soubise and other French gentlemen : proceeding shortly after to his carriage, he turned, in crossing the hall, to listen to a whisper from Colonel Friar, when an unknown hand plunged a knife into his heart, and left it sticking there. He cried "Villain !" plucked it out, staggered against a table, and immediately died. The French gentlemen were at first suspected of the deed, and narrowly escaped instant death ; while the real assassin had in the mean time reached the kitchen, and might have escaped : but, on a sudden alarm, he drew his sword, and exclaimed, "I am the man. He was immediately seized. His name, he said, was John Felton, a Protestant, and a lieutenant in the army, from which he had retired, as junior officers had been placed over his head, and his arrears of pay had been withheld. The remonstrance of the commons had convinced him that the duke was the cause of the national calamities, and that, by killing him, he should serve God, his king, and his country. He had no accomplices, had travelled seventy miles to do the deed, and had so little personal enmity, that, as he struck the blow, he prayed, "May God have mercy on thy soul !" Felton was forthwith transmitted to London, and underwent several examinations, but persisted in the same story. The Marquis of Dorset threatened him with the torture. "I am ready," he said ; "yet I must tell you, by-the-way, that I will then accuse you, my Lord of Dorset, and no one but yourself." The king wished to have him put to the rack : but the judges declared that torture was contrary to the laws of England. On the 27th of November Felton pleaded guilty, owning the enormity of his offence, and

praying that the hand which had done the criminal deed might be struck off before he died. He was executed as a murderer.

The king was at his prayers in a private house near Portsmouth, when the news of the duke's murder was brought to him. He testified no great emotion at the time, but nevertheless he felt it deeply. He took the family of his favourite under his protection, paid his debts, to the amount of £61,000, caused him to be buried in Westminster Abbey, and styled him "the martyr of his sovereign"—such was his infatuation! Buckingham was only thirty-six years of age, and his death was perhaps fortunate for himself, since, as Lingard justly observes, "if he had escaped the knife of the assassin, he would probably have fallen by the axe of the executioner." A more worthless minion, one more completely destitute of every good and great quality, it would be difficult to find; and one blushes to think of England being governed, as in effect it was, for so many years, by such an ignorant, insolent, and profligate upstart.

The expedition to Rochelle sailed under the Earl of Lindsey, but its efforts were of no avail. The town surrendered at discretion, and the Huguenot power was completely broken.

About this time the king gained to his side a man in all respects incomparably the superior of Buckingham. Sir Thomas Wentworth, a man of large fortune and great influence in Yorkshire, had sat in every parliament since 1614. He had followed a neutral line of conduct, but his natural temper inclined him to the side of arbitrary power. In the present parliament, however, he had shown himself one of the most prominent champions of freedom: for Buckingham, out of jealousy, had deprived him of the office of *Custos Rotulorum* of his county; and, while that wound was yet raw, a privy-seal had been sent him, at the suggestion of his rival, Sir John Savile. He refused compliance, was brought before the council, and committed to prison. In the ensuing parliament he took his place among the patriots, and displayed such abil-



ity and energy that the court saw their error, and resolved to gain him if possible. This was easily effected. He was made a baron, and then a viscount and lord-president of the council of the north; and he never after wavered in his devotion to despotism.

The king at this time also gave great offence to the parliament by promoting certain divines whom they had censured. Montague was made Bishop of Chester, and Mainwaring, Sibthorpe, Cousins, and others, obtained good livings. In contempt, likewise, of the parliament, the duties of tonnage and poundage were still levied; and the goods of Rolles, a member of the commons, Chambers, and other merchants who refused to pay them, were seized.

On the 20th of January, 1629, parliament reassembled. The fraud of the king in the printing of the Petition of Right was made known, the case of Rolles was brought before the house, and the sheriff of London and the officers of the customs had to appear at the bar. The king then summoned both houses to meet him at Whitehall, and there urged them to put an end to all disputes by passing the bill for tonnage and poundage: assuring them that he did not take these duties as a part of his prerogative, but by the gift of his people; and that, if he had levied them hitherto, he did it out of necessity, and not "by any right which he assumed." The commons, however, took no heed of this and other attempts to obtain money without conditions. It was their fixed and just principle, that inquiry into and redress of grievances should precede the granting of supplies; and this they immediately set about, directing their attention first of all to the important subject of religion. On the 27th, Sir John Eliot addressed the house in an able speech in reference to the religious innovations lately made, and the result was a "vow," entered on their journals, to admit no new sense of the articles of religion.\* After a few days the house ad-

\* Charles's indignation was more particularly excited on this occasion by the attempt to limit his ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It

journed to the 25th of February, on which day it was agreed to present charges to the king against Laud, bishop of London. The king then ordered both houses to adjourn to the 2d of March.

On this memorable day Eliot entered the house with a protestation which he had prepared, for the purpose of submitting it to the members. It contained the following articles: 1. Whoever shall innovate in religion, by introducing popery, Arminianism, etc., is an enemy to the kingdom and commonwealth. 2. Whoever shall counsel to take, or shall assist in taking tonnage and poundage not granted by parliament, is an enemy, etc. 3. Whoever shall pay the same is an enemy, etc. After having introduced these resolutions by a speech directed chiefly against the Lord-treasurer Weston, he desired Sir John Finch, the speaker, to read them: but he refused. The clerk did the same. Eliot now read them himself, and required the speaker to put them to vote. He replied, that "he was commanded otherwise by the king," and rose to quit the chair: but two members, Hollis and Valentine, held him down. A tumult arose; swords were near being drawn: Eliot now gave the protestation to Hollis to put it to the house, and it was received with acclamations. The king thereupon sent the sergeant to take away the mace;\* but he was detained, and the doors were locked. The usher of the black rod then came, but he could not gain admission; and, in a rage, the king ordered the captain of the guard to go and force the doors: but the members, having passed the protestation and adjourned to the

will be recollected that, after the abrogation of the papal authority in the reign of Henry VIII., the king was declared to be supreme head of the church. By virtue of this high office, the English sovereigns were invested with almost unlimited power in all matters relating not only to church government, but to the exercise of religious freedom as to modes of faith and worship by the subject. Now, as this was almost the only formidable prerogative of the crown which had been left unassailed by the Petition of Rights, the king was particularly anxious to guard it from all encroachment.—*Am. Ed.*

\* The ensign of the speaker's office.

10th, now issued forth in a body. Eliot, Hollis, Valentine, and others, were forthwith summoned before the council, and, on their refusing to answer out of parliament for things said and done in it, they were committed to the Tower. On the 10th the king went down to the house of lords and dissolved the parliament, on account, he said, of "the seditious carriage of some vipers, members of the lower house."

The imprisoned members applied for their *habeas corpus*: but the king, by removing them from the custody of the officers to whom the writs were directed, frustrated their efforts. They were offered their liberty if they would petition the king, and express contrition for having offended him. This course they at once rejected, as it would be an acknowledgment of the legality of the arbitrary acts which they had opposed. Eliot, Harris, and Valentine were finally proceeded against in the King's Bench, and sentenced to be imprisoned during pleasure; and Eliot was fined £1000, Hollis 1000 marks, and Valentine £500. The others were released after a confinement of eighteen months. Eliot ended his days in the Tower. When the decline of his health finally induced him to yield to the entreaties of his friends, and petition for his liberty, the answer given was, "It is not humble enough." He sent a second petition by his young son, offering to return to his prison when he should recover his health. This, also, was ineffectual. After his death, his children petitioned to be allowed to take his body to Cornwall, to be deposited in the tomb of his ancestors. "Let Sir John Eliot's body be buried in the church of that parish where he died," was the unfeeling reply of the monarch.

Thus terminated Charles's third parliament. As we shall now find him for some years altogether dispensing with these assemblies, taking his subjects' money at his own arbitrary will, and running the full career of despotism, we will transcribe the following passage from his panegyrist, Lord Clarendon. "It is not to be denied," he says, "that there were in all those parliaments, especially in that of the fourth

year, several passages and distempered speeches of particular persons not fit for the dignity and honour of those places, and unsuitable to the reverence due to his majesty and his councils. But I do not know any formal act of either house (for neither the remonstrance nor votes of the last day were such) that was not agreeable to the wisdom and justice of great courts on those extraordinary occasions. And whoever considers the acts of power and injustice in the intervals of parliament, will not be much scandalized at the warmth and vivacity of those meetings."

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### CHARLES I. (CONTINUED).

1629-1640.

The Cabinet.—Laud and the Church.—Persecution of Leighton, Prynne, and others.—Mode of Raising a Revenue.—Ship-money.—John Hampden.—Settlement of New-England.—Affairs of Scotland.—Attempt to introduce a Liturgy.—The Covenant.—The Episcopal War.—The Short Parliament.—Scots enter England.—Despotism of Charles.

For a period of twelve years we are now to witness the exercise of despotic power in England: the king, like his royal brethren of France and Spain, taking his subjects' money at will, giving no account of its expenditure, and arbitrarily punishing all who dared to murmur or oppose the civil and religious despotism he had established.

External tranquillity being necessary for his designs, Charles made peace with the courts of France and Spain. When the illustrious Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden put himself at the head of the Protestant cause in Germany, six thousand men were raised, at the expense of the king, for his aid, in the name of the Marquis of Hamilton, who commanded them. This

was the only money employed for foreign purposes : the produce of the taxes, and of the impositions generally, went to the support of the government, and to the maintenance of a most brilliant and expensive court.

After the death of Buckingham (the only man he seems ever to have loved) Charles had no favourite, and became his own minister. The queen, a vain, selfish, obstinate woman, possessed a pernicious influence over his mind. He had drawn from the popular side not only Wentworth and Savile, but Sir Dudley Digges, whom he made master of the rolls ; and the two lawyers Noy and Littleton, the former of whom he appointed to the office of attorney and the latter to that of solicitor general. Sir Richard Weston, the lord-treasurer, a suspected Catholic, was one of the most unscrupulous instruments of the royal despotism.

In his project for abolishing the liberties of the people, Charles was aided also by the hierarchy of the church, headed by William Laud, whom the favour of Buckingham had raised rapidly through various gradations to the see of London ; and whom, on the death of Abbot in 1632, the king had advanced to the primacy. Laud was a man of narrow mind, but of much reading : matters, therefore, of little importance to enlarged intellects, appeared of great moment to him. Thus he had conceived a ridiculously exalted notion of the value of particular ceremonies in sustaining religion, and a most extravagant opinion of the sublimity of the episcopal office. He also held to the Arminian tenets. In all these matters his sincerity, perhaps, is not to be questioned ; but then he was actuated by a cruel, persecuting spirit, and would allow no one to maintain any sentiment contrary to his own.

The following are some of the religious changes which he had caused to be made at this time. New ceremonies were employed in the consecration of churches ; the habiliments of the officiating ministers became more gaudy ; the use of pictures, images, crucifixes, and lights in the churches was contended for ;

and prayers for the dead, confession, and absolution were inculcated. The doctrine of the real presence, or something very nearly resembling it, seems to have been held by Laud and others.\*

The Catholics were full of hopes at witnessing these favourable symptoms in the Church of England, and the court of Rome was induced to send an envoy, named Panzani, to London. A negotiation for the union of the churches was commenced with him by Lord Cottington, Secretary Windebank, and Bishop Montague, though entirely unknown to Laud and the clergy in general. Like all projects of the kind, it proved entirely abortive: for Rome never recedes from any one of her pretensions. The king, in return for the courtesies which the court of Rome lavished on him, stopped the prosecution of the recusants: it was agreed, also, that diplomatic relations should be established between the two courts in the name of the queen, and Panzani was succeeded in his post at London by a Scotsman named Conn, whose place was afterward taken by an agent of higher rank, the Count Rosetti. The Catholics, says Clarendon, "attempted, and sometimes obtained, proselytes of weak, uninformed ladies, with such circumstances as provoked the rage and destroyed the charity of great and powerful families," and they urged on the court in all its ruinous and oppressive measures. "To conclude," he adds, "they carried themselves so as if they had been suborned by the Scots to root out their own religion."

The punishments inflicted on those who impugned the innovations in the church were very severe; and the licensing of the press being in the hands of the dominant party, no works in opposition to them could be printed. It was not even permitted to publish anything against the Church of Rome; and it will scarcely be believed, that Fox's Book of Martyrs, Jewell's works, and the celebrated Practice of Piety, failed at this time to obtain a license to be printed.

The treatment of the father of the excellent Arch-

\* See Appendix (A.)

bishop Leighton will serve to give an idea of the punishments inflicted on those who drew on themselves the vengeance of the implacable Laud. Leighton, a Scots divine, had printed in Holland a book entitled "Zion's Plea against Prelacy," addressed to the members of the late parliament. In this he no doubt treated the bishops with great rudeness and violence, terming them "men of blood," and prelacy "antichristian," declaring "the fearful sin of their pestering God's worship, and overlaying people's consciences with the inventions of men, yea, with the trumpery of Antichrist," and calling on the parliament utterly to root out the hierarchy. Speaking of the queen, he styled her a daughter of Heth, that is, simply a papist in the language of the time. For this, in 1630, he was sentenced by the court of Star Chamber to be committed to the Fleet for life; to be fined £10,000; to be degraded from his ministry; to be pilloried and whipped; to have an ear cut off, a nostril slit, and his cheek branded with SS (*i. e.*, Sower of Sedition) at Westminster, and to have the latter repeated some days after at Cheapside. When this cruel sentence was pronounced, Laud pulled off his cap and gave thanks to God for it; and in his Diary he records minutely, and without the slightest pity or remorse, how it was carried into execution. Leighton lay in his dungeon till the year 1641, when he was released by the parliament.

William Prynne, a barrister, published at this time a ponderous quarto volume, called "*Histriomastix*," full of zeal and learning against plays and players. Prynne had already incurred the enmity of Laud and his party by some works against Arminianism and prelatic jurisdiction, and they were on the watch for him. It happened, about six weeks after Prynne's publication, that the queen performed a part in a pastoral at Somerset House; and as in his book it was said that women-actors among the Greeks and Romans were all notoriously bad characters, Laud showed the passage to the king, affirming that it was meant for the queen; but the royal pair took no notice of it. Laud resolved, however, not to be balked, and

set his trusty chaplain, Peter Heylin, to examine all Prynne's works, and collect the scandalous points out of them. These Laud carried himself to Noy on a Sunday morning, desiring him to prosecute Prynne in the Star Chamber. Noy complied, and Prynne was sentenced to pay a fine of £1000; to be expelled from Oxford and Lincoln's Inn; to be degraded from his profession in the law; to stand twice in the pillory, losing an ear each time; to have his books burned before his face by the hangman, and to be imprisoned for life. This sentence also was carried into effect.

About this time, too, Dr. Bastwick, a learned physician, having published a book called "*Elenchus Papsismi et Flagellum Episcoporum Latialium*" (*Confutation of Popery, and a Rod for the Italian Bishops*), in answer to one Short, a Romanist, was brought before the High Commission court for it. He too was sentenced to be fined £1000, excommunicated, forbidden to practice physic, and imprisoned till he should recant. At the same time, one Chowney wrote a book in defence of the Church of Rome, to prove it a true church, and Laud sanctioned the book and accepted the dedication of it. Whitelock says he was told that the bishops, in their censure of Bastwick, denied that they held their jurisdiction as bishops from the king, affirming that they received it from God alone.

Another sufferer in these days was John Lilburne, afterward so famous. He was then a mere youth; but, being convicted of distributing pamphlets against the bishops, he was whipped from the Fleet to Westminster, set in the pillory, and treated with great cruelty.

The modes in which Charles raised a revenue at this time were as follows: 1. He levied tonnage and poundage, increasing the duties in many cases. 2. For a certain fine he pardoned frauds in the sale of former crown-lands, and allowed defective titles to be remedied. 3. He obliged all who had not come to receive knighthood at his coronation to compound for their neglect. 4. He revived monopolies, giving them to companies of merchants, who were to pay a large



sum down, and a certain duty on the articles they sold or manufactured. 5. He extorted fines for disobedience to proclamations, even when they had been contrary to law, such as that of his father against building in and about London. 6. The forest-laws were revived, and the king's forestal rights rigidly asserted, to the great havoc of private property. The forests in Essex were so extended as to take in almost the whole county. Lord Southampton lost so much of his property in this way as to be nearly ruined, and several others were heavily fined for encroachments.\* In a word, the king, looking upon all the rights and privileges of the people as so many usurpations on the absolute power of the crown, unscrupulously resorted to the most arbitrary and obnoxious measures of former reigns.

But, though much individual hardship was endured in consequence of these oppressive modes of taxation, the country was, on the whole, in a flourishing condition. The advocates of Charles would fain ascribe the merit of this to the government: but a more probable and adequate cause is to be found in the energy of the English people, which even the worst government cannot totally repress.

The year 1637 is rendered memorable in consequence of the stand made by the celebrated John Hampden and others against the arbitrary system of taxation at this time exercised by the crown. The impost which gave occasion to it was that of ship-money: a device of the apostate lawyer Noy, who, by a diligent search through the dusty records of the Tower, had discovered that, in ancient times, the seaports, the maritime counties, and even some places inland, had been required to furnish shipping for the public service. The particular use which Noy proposed to make of his discovery his death prevents us from ascertaining: but his seed had not fallen on a barren soil in the council;

\* Lord Salisbury was fined 20,000*l.*, Lord Westmoreland 19,000*l.*, and Sir Christopher Hatton 12,000*l.*, for encroachments on Rockingham forest, the boundaries of which were extended from six to sixty miles.—Strafford's Papers, ii., 117.

for in 1634 a writ was issued to the magistrates of London and other ports, requiring them to furnish ships of war of a certain tonnage, and fully equipped. The citizens of London pleaded their charter, but to no purpose, and the writ was everywhere obeyed. There was a plausible pretext, indeed, for augmenting the navy at this time. The rovers of the piratical states of Africa dared to appear even in the British Channel, and even landed and carried away into slavery some of the inhabitants of the south coast of Ireland: the French and Dutch fished with impunity at the same time in the British seas. But Charles had still another reason for wishing to be master of a powerful navy. His anxiety for the recovery of the Palatinate, and probably his dislike of freedom, had caused him, in 1631, to sign a secret treaty with Spain for the conquest of Holland, in which it was stipulated that his share of the spoil should be the island of Zealand.\* Yet, so inconsistent and insincere was this ill-judging prince, that in the very next year, 1632, he entered into a negotiation with the malecontents of the Low Countries to aid them in casting off the yoke of Spain, in the hope of obtaining the sovereignty for himself, or perhaps with a view to the interest of the elector palatine. But there was a Spanish party in his council, and Lord Cottington secretly informed the court of Madrid of the intrigue.† Charles then adhered to the former treaty, till, aware that the house of Austria was only deluding him, he was induced by the queen's party in the cabinet to form closer relations with the court of France. Yet he still continued to make overtures to that of Spain, and the consequence was that he drew on himself the secret enmity of both.

Charles had now a fleet of sixty sail, and the purpose for which ship-money had been exacted was thus fully answered. But it was now thought that the precedents collected by Noy might be made to extend

\* Clarendon Papers, i., 49; ii., Append. xxvi. Hallam, ii., 17.

† Hardwick Papers, ii. 54. Hallam, ii., 18.

much farther, and converted into a source of permanent revenue. The honour of this discovery is ascribed to the late speaker Finch, at this time chief-justice of the common pleas. Writs for the levy of ship-money were accordingly directed to the sheriffs of all the counties; and when the people began to murmur, an opinion of the twelve judges in favour of its legality was obtained by the court and published. Some, however, ventured to appeal to the laws against it. The first was the stout-hearted citizen John Chambers, who brought an action against the lord-mayor for imprisoning him on his refusal to pay it. Lord Say and Mr. Hampden also appealed to the judicial tribunals; and the decision in the case of the latter seemed to set the matter at rest, and to prove that no redress was to be looked for.

John Hampden was a gentleman of good fortune in Buckinghamshire, who had set in all the parliaments since the year 1620: he was the friend of Eliot, and, like him, strenuous in maintaining the rights of the people. Having been assessed twenty shillings for ship-money, he refused to pay it. The cause was brought before the twelve judges in the exchequer chamber, and was argued in behalf of Hampden by St. John and Holborne; and on the part of the crown by Bankes, the attorney, and Littleton, the solicitor general. Hampden's counsel urged that the constitution had provided in various ways for the public safety, both by the ordinary revenues and by parliamentary supplies. They showed from Magna Charta, the Confirmation of the Charters, the statute "*De Tallagio non Concedendo*," and other acts of the legislature, that the consent of parliament is indispensable to legal taxation; they asserted that none of the precedents adduced on the other side applied to the case of an inland county, and finally concluded by appealing to the Petition of Rights. The king's counsel, on their side, cited the Danegelt of Anglo-Saxon times, and the precedents collected by Noy, many of which certainly bore a strong analogy to the present case: but they were in remote times, and could not claim authority

like the aforementioned more recent statutes. "But," said Bankes, "this power is innate in the person of an absolute king, and in the persons of the kings of England. It is not any ways derived from the people, but reserved unto the king when positive laws first began. For the King of England, he is an absolute monarch; nothing can be given to an absolute prince but what is inherent in his nature. He can do no wrong; he is the sole judge, and we ought not to question him." "This imposition without parliament," said Judge Crawley, "appertains to the king originally, and to the successor *ipso facto*, if he be a sovereign, in right of his sovereignty from the crown. You cannot have a king without these royal rights, no, not by act of parliament." Finch maintained that no act of parliament could bar the king of his right to defend his people; and that, therefore, acts "to bind the king not to command the subjects, their persons and goods, and their money too," are void.

Seven of the twelve judges gave judgment for the crown, and the remaining five in favour of Hampden: Croke and Hutton, two of the most distinguished, denying in the strongest terms the alleged right of the crown, and the legality of the writ for ship-money.\* The tax was now adjudged lawful: but the decision, as Clarendon observes, "proved of more advantage and credit to the gentleman condemned (Mr. Hampden) than to the king's service." The high notions of the royal authority put forth by the crown lawyers alarmed all classes of people, for they saw no limitation to it but the royal will; and, even though Charles himself were an Antonine, it would be put in the power of his successor to be a Tiberius. Ship-money after this was paid, though very reluctantly: it is said

\* Croke intended at first to give judgment for the king: but his wife, "a good and pious woman," told him, says Whitelock, "that she hoped he would do nothing against his conscience, for fear of any danger or prejudice to him or his family; and that she would be contented to suffer want or any misery with him rather than be an occasion for him to do or say anything against his judgment and conscience."

not to have averaged more than £200,000 a year; a considerable sum, however, and equal to three subsidies.

The indomitable Prynne had from his dungeon put forth a tract called "News from Ipswich," in which he assailed the prelates with great violence; Bastwick, too, had written diatribes against them; and a clergyman named Burton, who had been chaplain to Charles when prince, took the same ground. They were all three prosecuted in the Star Chamber, and sentenced to pay each a fine of £5000, to stand in the pillory, to have their ears cut off, and to be imprisoned during life.\* They were sent to the castles of Carnarvon, Lancaster, and Launceston, and were afterward removed to Jersey, Guernsey, and Scilly.

Williams, bishop of Lincoln, though no model of moral perfection, was a man in ability greatly superior to Laud, with whose new-fangled theology he did not agree, and he had much more statesmanlike ideas on the mode of dealing with the Puritans. Though it was chiefly through Williams that Laud had obtained his first bishopric, he had no feeling of gratitude, and was bent on his ruin. Williams was therefore accused in the Star Chamber of divulging secrets of state; and, while this case was pending, he was charged with tampering with the king's witnesses, suspended from his office, fined £10,000, and sentenced to be imprisoned during pleasure in the Tower. Afterward a letter from Osbaldiston, master of Westminster school, in which the words "little urchin" and "little great man" were thought to be meant for Laud, being found among the prelate's papers, he was sentenced to pay a farther fine of £5000 to the king and £3000 to the archbishop.

The state of civil and religious tyranny to which they were now subjected made men seek for some place of retreat, and they cast their eyes on the distant shores of the New World. In 1629 a charter had

\* Prynne now lost his remaining ear. There was an absurd report, that on the former occasion he had the absconded ear stitched on again.

been obtained for the colony of Massachusetts Bay, and about three hundred and fifty religious sectaries sailed thither. Numbers followed in the subsequent years, and the settlements were extended through the province, which was henceforth named New-England. After the failure of the attempt to resist the levying of ship-money, persons of higher rank, the lords Say and Brook, Sir Arthur Haselrig, Hampden, his kinsman Oliver Cromwell, and others, resolved to quit their now enslaved and degraded country. These last, it is said, in 1638, were actually on board the vessel which was to take them away, when a proclamation, dictated by the bigotry of Laud, appeared, forbidding masters of ships to carry out any passenger who had not a license from the privy council, and a testimonial of conformity from the minister of his parish.

Such was the condition of things in England: the affairs of Scotland now claim our attention.

In the year 1633 Charles visited his native kingdom for the first time since his accession. He was received with great affection and loyalty, and crowned with the usual splendour; but Laud, his evil genius, attended him, and the feelings of the people were shocked by the appearance of an altar with wax tapers and a crucifix, before which the officiating prelates bowed as they passed; and, when the Archbishop of Glasgow declined wearing the gorgeous habits provided for him, Laud rudely forced him from the side of the king, and put Maxwell, bishop of Ross, in his place.

A parliament was next assembled, which gave the king an occasion for displaying his arbitrary temper, and this served to alienate from him the affections of many of his nobles. He had, indeed, some years before, inflicted a wound, which still rankled in their minds, by resorting to a measure for the redemption of the church-lands and tithes which the nobility and gentry had seized and appropriated to themselves at the time of the Reformation.

Thus Charles left behind him in Scotland the seeds of future troubles; and the prosecution of Lord Balmerino, shortly after, powerfully aided to alienate the

nobility. This nobleman, who had been one of the opposition in parliament, happened to have in his possession a copy of an apology for their conduct, which he and his friends intended to have presented, but had been withheld by the fear of exciting the royal displeasure. A transcript of this was surreptitiously obtained by one who was his private enemy, and communicated to the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, by whom it was conveyed to the king, with an assurance that it had been circulated for signature throughout Scotland, and that it was the nobles who upheld the clergy in their opposition to the surplice. Balmerino was therefore selected for an example; and he was indicted on the statute of *leasing-making*, or promoting discord between the king and his people. A jury, with Lord Traquair, one of the ministers, for foreman, was selected to try him: yet so flagrantly iniquitous was the proceeding, that even that jury found him guilty only by the foreman's casting vote. The people were furious at this decision; and it was resolved, in secret consultations, that if anything should happen to him, they would massacre all those who had found him guilty. Traquair, on learning this, hasted up to London, and a pardon was granted to Balmerino; but the impression which his danger had made on the minds of the nobility and people was deep and permanent.

In religion matters were urged forward with a view of bringing Scotland into uniformity with England. The bishops began to appropriate the civil dignities to themselves. Archbishop Spottiswood was made chancellor; Maxwell, bishop of Ross, aspired to the office of lord-treasurer; and of the fourteen prelates, nine were members of the privy council. They had courts with powers similar to those of the court of High Commission in England; and, acting under the influence of Laud, they proceeded to draw up canons and a liturgy for the Church of Scotland. They commenced with the former, sanctioning the latter before it had been prepared. The whole structure of Presbytery was dissolved by these canons.\* Each church was

\* Among other things, these canons asserted the king's absolute

to have a font at the entrance, and an altar in the chancel; and various other regulations were adopted which the people regarded as little better than popery. The liturgy was chiefly compiled from that of the Church of England, but a report soon spread abroad that it was nothing more than a translation of the Catholic mass. From the pulpits the clergy declaimed against it, and it was reprobated in conversation and in pamphlets. Spottiswood, and the elder and more experienced prelates, recommended great caution in introducing it: but, on its transmission to London and its approval by Laud, a royal proclamation was issued, enjoining it to be used in every parish church in the kingdom by a certain day.

On the appointed day, July 23, 1637, the Dean of Edinburgh prepared to officiate according to the liturgy in St. Giles's, and the Bishop of Argyle in the Gray Friars' church. The judges, prelates, and members of the privy council were present in the former, which was thronged with people. When the service began, an old woman, it is said, filled with zeal, sprang up, and flung the stool she sat on at the dean's head, crying, "Villain! dost thou say the mass at my lug? (*ear*.)" A tumult quickly arose; the women rushed to seize the dean, and he escaped with difficulty; the Bishop of Edinburgh ascended the pulpit to appease the people; sticks and stones were flung at him; and, but for the aid of the magistrates, he would have perished on the spot. In the other church the service was interrupted by tears, groans, and lamentations, but there was no violence. Throughout the rest of Scotland the efforts of the prelates were unavailing, and the liturgy was used only at St. Andrew's and in three other cathedrals.

The clergy had been directed to purchase two cop-

and unlimited authority; forbade all extempore prayer by the clergy; required that all teachers of youth should be licensed by the bishop of the diocese; and declared that no person should be admitted to orders in the church, or permitted to perform any ecclesiastical duty, until he had first subscribed to the canons.—*Am. Ed.*



ies of the liturgy for each parish, and the prelates now proceeded to enforce obedience to this mandate. A divine named Henderson, and three others, presented supplications to suspend the charge. These being supported by several of the nobility and gentry, and the general aversion to the liturgy becoming manifest, the council made a representation to the king, obscurely intimating a desire that the liturgy should be recalled. But prudent concession was a thing unknown to Charles: a stern reproof, and an injunction for the immediate adoption of the ritual, were the answer returned. The consequence was an immense accession to the number of supplications, and a formal organization of the opponents of the liturgy throughout the kingdom.

In the month of October vast numbers of people flocked to Edinburgh to learn the king's reply to the supplications which had been transmitted to him. A proclamation ordered them to disperse: but they, in return, drew up an accusation against the prelates on account of the canons and liturgy, which was rapidly subscribed by the nobility, gentry, clergy, and people throughout Scotland. The following month they re-assembled in increased force; and, having obtained permission of the council to choose representatives to carry on the accusation, they appointed several of the nobility, two gentlemen for each county, and one or more of the clergy and burgesses for each presbytery and borough. Thus were formed the celebrated *Tables* or committees, which, being subdivided and regulated, gave order and consistency to their union. Their demands now increased: they required the abrogation of the high commission, the canons, and the liturgy. To this neither Laud nor the king could yield without the ruin of their favourite plans; and a proclamation was issued, censuring the supplicants, and forbidding them to assemble under the penalties of treason.

This was a fatal measure to the crown: for the Tables forthwith resolved on a renewal of the national covenant, the bond of religious union first adopted

by the Lords of the Congregation, and twice renewed in the reign of James. It took its name and character from the covenants of Israel with Jehovah recorded in the Scriptures, and it also partook much of the nature of the bonds of mutual defence and maintenance which had long prevailed in Scotland. It was now drawn up by Henderson, the leader of the clergy, and Johnstone of Wariston, a distinguished advocate. It renounced popery, and all its doctrines, practices, and claims, in the strongest terms; and then, declaring the liturgy and canons to be thus virtually renounced, concluded with an obligation to resist them, to defend each other, and to support the king in preserving religion, liberty, and law. The supplicants were invited by the Tables to repair to a solemn meeting at Edinburgh; a fast was appointed; and the preachers, as directed, recommended a renewal of the covenant. Accordingly, on the 1st of March, 1638, in the Gray Friars' church, it was solemnly renewed, with prayer and spiritual exhortations. The nobility, gentry, clergy, and thousands of all orders, sexes, and ages subscribed it; copies were transmitted to all parts of the kingdom; and it was everywhere subscribed to with shouts of joy, or with tears of contrition for their past defections. Within two months all Scotland (Aberdeen alone excepted) was banded to the covenant.

An independent assembly and a free parliament were the demands of the covenanters. The court employed every art to deceive them, being secretly resolved to resort to arms. With this view, all their demands (after Charles had taken sufficient care to convince them of his insincerity) were suddenly conceded; and, on the 21st of November, an assembly was held at Glasgow to regulate the church. The Marquis of Hamilton, the king's representative, was instructed to excite jealousies among the members, and, if he found the assembly restiff, to dissolve it. Seeing he could not manage it under the pretext of its being irregularly chosen, and, consequently, not competent to the trial of prelates (which was one of the measures proposed), he declared it dissolved, but the members

refused to separate ; their resolution was approved of by many of the privy council, and the accession to their side of the potent Earl of Argyle gave them increased courage. The acts of the six preceding assemblies were forthwith annulled, the canons, liturgy, and high commission were condemned, and episcopacy was abolished. Eight of the bishops were excommunicated, four deposed, and two suspended. And thus was prostrated, at a blow, the fabric which it had been the labour of two reigns to erect.

It had been Hamilton's advice to the king, from the beginning, to have recourse to arms, and the necessary preparations had therefore been made. To procure money, loans were required from the nobility ; under the influence of Laud, the church contributed largely ; and at the call of the queen, the Catholics, well aware that it was for their interest to support the crown, from which alone they could expect favour, gave their money freely for the support of the *Episcopal War*, as it was denominated. Arms and artillery were provided ; the counties were directed to send their train-bands or militia, and the peers to lead their retainers in arms to York. A negotiation (which was, however, frustrated) was also entered into with the regency of the Netherlands, for the use of six thousand veterans. The Covenanters, on their side, prepared for a defensive war. By means of the numerous Scottish pedlers who hawked their wares through England, they opened a communication with the English Puritans.\* Richelieu, willing to repay Charles in

\* They were also secretly informed of the king's counsels and designs : for Charles, like his father, had a great partiality for his countrymen ; and most of the offices in the court were occupied by Scotsmen. They were gentlemen of the bed-chamber, grooms of the stole, gentlemen-ushers, carvers, cup-bearers, etc. In them, too, nationality predominated over loyalty, gratitude, and honour : they watched their master's looks, they marked his words, they even stole his letters out of his pockets and transcribed them, and all was sent to Scotland. (See Carte, iv., 258.) Mr. Brodie (ii., 480) compliments the Covenanters on their "vigilance and means of acquiring information." Perhaps he was ignorant of what their means were.

kind, secretly supplied them with money, and arms and ammunition were purchased on the Continent. The covenant was sent to the Scots in the Swedish service for their subscription; and Alexander Lesley, an officer of great experience in the wars of Germany, was invited over to take the command of the army which was to be raised. Many other able officers also returned to their country, and the pulpits inculcated the justice of defensive warfare, and resounded with the curse of Meroz on those "who came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty." Volunteers crowded to the standards, and were disciplined by Lesley and his officers; the royal castles were all surprised, and the port of Leith was put into a state of defence. When the Gordons rose under their chief, the Earl of Huntley, to maintain the royal cause in the north, the Earl of Montrose marched against them, and compelled Huntley to come as an hostage to Edinburgh.

The king advanced at the head of twenty-three thousand men to Berwick. Lesley took his position at Dunse-law; while Munro, the second in command, was stationed at Kelso. The two armies were about equal in number: the king was superior in cavalry, but in infantry the advantage was entirely on the side of the Scots, who, in addition to superior discipline and better officers, were animated by a spirit of religious enthusiasm, while the English soldiers were utterly indifferent to the cause in which they were engaged. The Scottish camp continually resounded with psalmody and prayer; morning and evening the men were summoned to their devotions by beat of the drum, and two sermons preached every day kept up their fervour.

Lord Holland, who commanded the English cavalry, advanced to Kelso: but, at the sight of the Scottish forces, his men turned and fled. The king, who had expected that the Scots would have submitted at once on his appearance at the head of an army, now saw his hopes entirely baffled. It was evident, too, that all who attended him were adverse to the war:

Laud, even, aware of the superior strength of the enemy, counselled peace; and the Scots themselves were very reluctant to carry matters to extremes with their sovereign. Proposals for an accommodation were therefore readily listened to; on the 11th of June Scottish commissioners came to the royal camp, and the king treated with them in person: it was finally agreed that a parliament and a general assembly should meet in the month of August, to regulate the affairs of church and state. The Scottish army was then disbanded, and the royal castles restored.

The assembly and parliament met at the appointed time; the former came to the same decisions respecting episcopacy and other matters as had that of Glasgow; and Traquair, who presided over it, gave the royal assent to them. He had the king's authority for so doing; but Charles was nevertheless resolved to revoke, on the first convenient occasion, these, as he considered, unlawful concessions. The parliament not proving manageable, was prorogued for six months.

Charles now summoned Lord Wentworth over from Ireland, where for some years he had held the office of lord-deputy. He consulted with him, Laud, and Hamilton on the affairs of Scotland, and the result of their deliberations was a resolution to reduce the Scots by force of arms. Other members were then added to the council, to deliberate on the means of providing funds for the war; and, at their instance, Charles concluded to call a parliament.\* In the mean time, writs were issued for the levy of ship-money, and the lords subscribed various sums, Wentworth setting an example by putting down his name for £20,000. It was agreed that the parliament should not be called till the following April, in order to give Wentworth time for previously holding a parliament in Ireland, to which country he returned with the title of lord-lieutenant. He was, at the same time, elevated

\* According to Whitelock, it was Charles himself who proposed this measure.

in the English peerage, by being created Earl of Strafford.

The covenanters had sent the earls of Dumfermline and Loudon, Sir William Douglas, and Mr. Barclay, as commissioners to London, to make complaint to the king of the prorogation of the parliament and other injuries. They were also instructed, it would appear, to deal with the discontented English.\* Traquair, however, had got possession of the copy of a letter addressed to the King of France (*au Roi*), and signed by Lesley, Mar, Rothes, *Montrose*, Montgomery, Loudon, and the secretary Forrester, justifying their cause, and asking for aid.† The commissioners, therefore, were arrested, and Loudon was committed to the Tower. It is said that a warrant was issued for his execution without any trial; but that the lieutenant, a Scotsman, took it to the Marquis of Hamilton, who, though it was midnight, entered the apartment of the king, and prevailed on him to recall it, assuring him, if it were not done, that Scotland would be lost for ever. We trust that this story is not true: Charles, though a despot, was not a man of blood.

The Earl of Strafford having held his parliament in Ireland, where his will was law, and having obtained from it an unconditional grant of money, and levied an army of eight thousand men, returned to England; and, on the 13th of April, 1640, after an interval of twelve years, a parliament assembled at

\* "They had great resort to them," says Whitelock, "and many secret councils held with them by the discontented English, chiefly by those who favoured Presbytery and were no friends to bishops, or had suffered in the late censures in the Star Chamber, exchequer, high commission, and other judicatories. *They also who inclined to a republic* had much correspondence with them; and they courted all, fomented every discontent, and made large and religious promises of future happy times. The earls of Essex, Bedford, Holland, the Lord Say, Hampden, Pym, and divers other lords and gentlemen of great interest and quality, were deep in with them."

† The fact of this letter having been sent was long disputed. Mr. Mazure (*Hist. de Révolut. de 1688*, iii., 405) has put the matter out of doubt by printing it.

Westminster. Though a majority of the members had never set before, the composition of the house of commons was essentially the same as before, the Puritan and patriotic party greatly preponderating in it. The king, on the opening of the session, having addressed them in a short speech, the lord-keeper related all the proceedings in Scotland; and saying to them that "his majesty did not expect advice from them, much less that they should interpose in any office of mediation which would not be grateful to him," he demanded that they should grant a supply forthwith; after which, he added, time enough should be granted them to represent any grievance, and to receive a favourable reply. The commons having then chosen Sergeant Glanville for their speaker, prepared to proceed to business;\* and "while men," says Clarendon, "gazed upon each other, looking who should begin (much the greatest part having never before sat in parliament), Mr. Pym, a man of good reputation, but much better known afterward, who had been as long in those assemblies as any man then living, brake the ice." In a speech of two hours' length, he enumerated and dwelt upon all the grievances which afflicted the state, under the heads of breach of parliamentary privilege, injury to the established religion, and invasion of the subjects' rights of liberty and property. Having then shown that these abuses were as hurtful to the crown as to the people, he proposed that the lords should be invited to join in a petition to the king, and in deliberating on the causes and remedies of these evils. Other members followed in the same strain: but, when one of them termed ship-money an *abomination*, he was called to the bar, and narrowly escaped being reprimanded. Clarendon says he mentions this, "that the temper and sobriety of that house may be taken notice of."

\* "The house met always at eight of the clock and rose at twelve, which were the old parliament hours, that the committees, upon whom the greatest burden of business lay, might have the afternoon for its preparation and despatch."—Clarendon, i., 233.

The court, impatient for the money, prevailed on the peers to urge the commons to proceed immediately with the supply. This interference was voted to be a high breach of privilege. The king then sent to say, that if they would grant him twelve subsidies, to be paid in twelve years, he would renounce all title or pretence to ship-money in future. This matter had been discussed for two days, when, on a proposal of Mr. Hyde, that the question of supply simply should be first put, Sir Henry Vane, the treasurer, declared he had authority to state that the king would only accept of it in the manner and proportion proposed in his message. He was followed by the solicitor-general, and, it being near five o'clock, the house adjourned. The next day, May 5th, the king dissolved the parliament. Three members were then committed, and a declaration was published, giving the reasons for the dissolution, charging the disaffected members "with attempting to direct the government, and to examine and censure its acts, as if kings were bound to give an account of their regal actions, and of their manner of government, to their subjects assembled in parliament." Thus abruptly terminated the Short Parliament, as it was named: but, contrary to the usual custom, the convocation continued to sit till the end of the month. It passed canons ordering the clergy to teach the people the divine right of kings, and the damnable sin of resistance to their authority; imposing on them the *et cetera* oath,\* as it was called, and finally granting the king a benevolence of four shillings in the pound for six years.

The dissolution was a matter of exultation to Pym and his friends, for they knew that the king must soon call another parliament. Oliver St. John said to Hyde "that all was well, and that it would be worse before it could be better; and that this parliament could never have done what was necessary to be

\* This oath was to maintain the church as it was. One of the clauses was, "Nor give consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, &c."



done." Their communications with the Scottish agents now became more frequent, and the future tactics were definitively arranged.

Preparations for the invasion of Scotland were now made; the voluntary loan produced £300,000; each one of the counties was required to furnish a certain number of men, provide them with coat and conduct-money, and furnish horses. It was proposed to enter Scotland with 20,000 men from England, and 10,000 from Ireland; while Hamilton should pour down with 10,000 more from the Highlands. The want of funds, and the activity of the covenanters, frustrated this plan. Charles gave the chief command of his army to the Earl of Northumberland: but that nobleman falling sick, he assumed it himself. Strafford was his lieutenant-general, and Lord Conway commanded the cavalry.

Conway marched with the first troops that were levied into Northumberland. The Scottish army of 26,000 men was encamped at Dunse, and on the 12th of August, at the desire, as they believed, of their English friends,\* they crossed the Tweed and entered England. Conway prepared to dispute the passage of the Tyne at Newburn, but it was nevertheless forced by the Scots, who speedily became masters of the two northern counties; and, these being the coal counties, they were enabled to distress the city of London with want of fuel whenever they pleased. At the same time, they forced the inhabitants to pay them £5600 a week, and seized the property of the clergy and the Catholics.

The king was now at York with a disaffected army. He had summoned a great council of the peers to meet him there on the 24th of September, and he proposed to lay before it the petition which the Scots had now sent him. He had also received a supplication signed by twelve peers, and another signed by ten

\* Lord Savile had written them a letter, to which he forged the signatures of some of the leading opposition peers, inviting them to enter England.

thousand citizens of London, praying that he would call a parliament: a measure which his council likewise advised. Accordingly, when the great council met, he announced his intention of summoning a parliament for the 3d of November, and sixteen peers then proceeded to Ripon to treat with the Scots. The negotiation was soon transferred to London, and it was arranged that, while it was pending, the northern counties should pay the Scots £5600 a week, to be repaid out of the first supply granted by parliament.

The despotism of Charles was now drawing to its close. We have exposed it freely, and fully shown that its effect and design were to deprive the nation of all that is most valuable to civilized man. The lives, the liberties, and the property of the people were to be all at the absolute disposal of the monarch, who held himself accountable to God alone for the exercise of the powers which he claimed. A galling ecclesiastical tyranny pressed also on the people, fettering conscience, and controlling the free expression of thought. Is there any one so base and unworthy of the name of freeman, as to regret that this condition of things was not made permanent, and handed down to our own times? And what assurance have we that such would not have been the case, had not Charles been checked in his lawless career? We are now to witness the conduct of the men who crushed this despotism, and it shall be our endeavour to treat them with the same impartiality that we have sought to exercise in the case of the imperious sovereign.

## CHAPTER V.

## CHARLES I. (CONTINUED).

1640-1641.

**The Long Parliament.—Impeachment and Trial of Strafford.—Army-plot.—Execution of Strafford.—Arts of the Popular Leaders.**

ON the 3d of November, 1640, that parliament met whose deeds for good or for evil have rendered it, with one exception, the most memorable assembly in the annals of the world. The greatest exertions had been made by both parties to procure returns favourable to their political views; but the efforts of Pym, Hampden, and the other leaders of the popular party, joined with the feelings of the electors themselves, who saw the necessity of reform in the state, had obtained for them, in most places, a triumph over their opponents. The members of the Long Parliament, as this was subsequently styled, were in general men of high moral character, of cultivated minds, and of independent fortunes, the landed property of the commons having been, it was said, treble that of the peers.

Still we must not be blinded by partiality, nor give the reins to fancy, and imagine in the Pym, the Hampdens, and the St. Johns of those days men without blemish, raised above the common lot of humanity, and incapable of artifice or error. We shall find them employing the arts so universally practised by political parties, acting at times in violation of the principles of justice, and treading in the footsteps of the despotism which they sought to restrain. We have not palliated or concealed the faults of the king: we will not pass over in silence those of the parliament.

It may here be of advantage to mention the individuals in this parliament who took the lead in opposing the excesses of the prerogative. In the house of

peers, the principal were Percy, earl of Northumberland; Wriothesley of Southampton; Devereux of Essex; Rich of Warwick, and his brother of Holland; Russell of Bedford; Hollis of Clare; Herbert of Pembroke; Cecil of Salisbury; Fiennes, viscount Say; Greville, lord Brooke; and Montague, lord Mandeville, son to the Earl of Manchester, who sat as Baron Kimbolton. Most of these were men of honour and principle, desirous of reforming, but, at the same time, of preserving the constitution unimpaired in church and state. Say and Brooke alone wished to overturn the church, but both from conscientious motives. Holland and Pembroke were men of no principle. The former had been a creature of Buckingham, who procured for him a marriage with the heiress of Cope, lord of the manor of Kensington, by which title he was created a baron; and afterward had him placed about the Prince of Wales, made Earl of Holland, knight of the garter, &c. After the death of his patron he attached himself to the queen, and no man enjoyed a greater share of the court favour. It was hatred of Strafford, and not regard to the interests of his country, that placed him in the ranks of the patriots. Pembroke was a man thoroughly contemptible. He was indebted for his rank to his handsome person, and his skill in horses and dogs, which won him the favour of King James, combined with the merit, perhaps, of having tamely submitted to corporeal chastisement from one of the insolent Scottish favourites.\* According to Clarendon, it was fear of impeachment that made him a patriot. The character of Salisbury was little more estimable than that of Pembroke.

In the commons the leading men were Pym and Hampden, of whom we shall have abundant occasion to speak; Denzil Hollis, brother to Lord Clare; Pierrepoint, son of the Earl of Kingston; Nathaniel Fiennes, son of Lord Say; Oliver St. John, a natural son of the house of Bolingbroke; Sir Henry Vane, son of the secretary; Lord Digby, son of the Earl of Bristol;

\* See Osborne.

Lucius Cary, viscount Falkland; Sir Arthur Haselrig; Sir Henry Mildmay; Sir John Colepepper; Sir William Armyne; Henry Martin; the lawyers Hyde (afterward Earl of Clarendon), Whitelock, Glyn, Maynard, Palmer, and others. Of these, Falkland, Digby, Colepepper, Hyde, and others, who were as zealous in the correction of abuses at the first as any, when they saw the ulterior object of their coadjutors, joined the party of the king. Vane, Haselrig, and Martin alone can be regarded as decided republicans at the commencement. Of these, Vane was an exceedingly honest and able, but eccentric statesman: Haselrig was a bold, hot-headed, overbearing man: Martin was witty and ingenious, but without religion, and notoriously dissolute.

The views of the popular leaders may be collected from the following incident. A few days before the parliament met, as Pym and Hyde were conversing on the state of affairs, the former said "that they must now be of another temper than they were the last parliament; that they must not only sweep the house clean below, but must pull down all the cobwebs which hung in the top and corners, that they might not breed dust, and so make a foul house hereafter; that they had now an opportunity to make their country happy, by removing all grievances, and pulling up the causes of them by the roots, if all men would do their duties," and much more to the same effect.\* The parliament, Clarendon observes, "had a sad and melancholic aspect upon the first entrance, which presaged some unusual and unnatural events." The king did not go in his customary state, taking his way thither by water. He was also disappointed in his expectation of having the recorder of London, Sir Thomas Gardiner, chosen speaker, as he was not returned for any place. His choice then fell upon a lawyer named Lenthall, a man of good practice in his profession, but of no parliamentary experience, and little calculated to maintain the dignity of such an office.

\* Clarendon, i., 298.

The first week was employed in the formation of committees and the reception of petitions, many of which were brought up by troops of horsemen from the country. On the 10th the Earl of Strafford came up from the north, at the earnest desire of the king. He was aware of his danger, knowing himself to be the object of the hostility of the popular party, and also of the Scots: but the king gave him his solemn assurance "that the parliament should not touch a hair of his head." The next day Pym suddenly rose, and, stating that he had matter of high import to communicate, desired that the strangers' room should be cleared, the outer door of the house locked, and the key laid on the clerk's table. When all this had been done, he again rose, and, dilating on all the various illegal acts that had been done, and magnifying the virtues of the king, he added, "We must inquire from what fountain these waters of bitterness flowed," and who they were that had so perverted the king's excellent judgment. He next proceeded to say, that "he believed there was one more signal in that administration than the rest, being a man of great parts and contrivance, and of great industry to bring what he designed to pass: a man who, in the memory of many present, had sat in that house, an earnest vindicator of the laws, and a most zealous assertor and champion for the liberties of the people, but long since turned apostate from those good affections, and, according to the custom and nature of apostates, was become the greatest enemy to the liberties of his country, and the greatest promoter of tyranny that any age had produced." He then named Thomas, earl of Strafford, and ran through the whole history of his administration in the North and in Ireland, "adding," says Clarendon, "some lighter passages of his vanity and amours; that they who were not inflamed with anger and detestation against him for the former, might have less esteem and reverence for his prudence and discretion." Other speakers followed in the same strain. A message then came from the lords, desiring a conference: but the reply was made that they

were engaged in weighty business ; and notice was at the same time sent to their friends in the peers to keep that house from rising. It was finally moved to impeach the earl of high treason, not a single voice dissenting, only Lord Falkland (who was no friend to him) proposing that it were better to digest the accusation previously in a committee. But Pym declared that such a course would blast all their hopes, as the earl, so soon as he was notified of it, would procure the parliament to be dissolved. It was resolved, therefore, to proceed at once : the doors were now thrown open, and Pym issued forth at the head of three hundred members, and, at the bar of the house of lords, solemnly impeached the earl of high treason, in the name of the commons of England.

Strafford, who had been in conference with the king, hastened to the house ; and "with a proud, glooming countenance," was making towards his place at the board-head, when he was ordered to retire. He obeyed : after some delay he was recalled, and directed to kneel at the bar ; and then he was delivered over to the usher of the black rod, to be kept in custody. He passed to his coach through a crowd of people, "all gazing," says Baillie, "no man capping to him, before whom that morning the greatest of England would have stood uncovered." None, however, insulted him.\*

The impeachment of Strafford was certainly a masterly manœuvre on the part of the popular leaders ; and the unanimity of the vote proves the general feeling that he was a chief encourager of the royal excesses. But if it be true that he was prepared to impeach them for their dealings with the Scots, the purity of their patriotism on this occasion will appear less certain. A farther stroke of policy was the impeachment of his friend, Sir George Radcliffe, whose evidence might be of advantage to the earl.

The objects aimed at were good, but the straight

\* As Ireland and the north of England had been the scenes of his public acts, the people of London could have had but little immediate knowledge of his character.

path of justice was not always followed by the patriots. Their committee of elections, for example, unseated many members who did not suit their views. "It was often said by leading men among them," says Clarendon, "that they ought in those cases to be guided by the fitness and worthiness of the person, whatever the desire of those was in whom the right of election remained. And, therefore, one man hath been admitted upon the same rule by which another hath been rejected." One of their rules was, that no one should sit "who had been a party or a favourer of any project, or who had been employed in any illegal commission." On this ground several were removed; but the king afterward charged them with not having applied their rule impartially, passing over their own friends, Sir Henry Mildmay and Mr. Whittaker, "who had been scandalously engaged in those pressures."

Under the newly-adopted term of *Delinquents* again, all the lieutenants and deputies of counties who had exercised power not strictly warranted by statute were brought into danger. The sheriffs, and all concerned in raising ship-money, were also voted delinquents. Farmers of the revenue and officers of the customs were similarly treated. The judgment in the case of Hampden was reversed; and those judges who had honoured it were obliged to give large security to abide the decision of the parliament. One of them, Sir John Berkeley, was arrested as he sat on the bench, and taken to prison, "which struck," says Whitelock, "a great terror in the rest of his brethren then sitting in Westminster Hall, and in all his profession," as no doubt it was meant that it should.

An impeachment against Laud was also carried up to the lords by Denzil Hollis, and that prelate was committed to the usher of the black rod. The lord-keeper Finch and secretary Windebank being menaced with impeachment, fled to the Continent.

Bishop Williams, who had lain for three years in the Tower, was now released, as was also the unfortunate Leighton. Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton were recalled from their island-prisons; and they entered



London in a kind of triumph, being followed by five thousand persons, men and women, on horseback, wearing bay and rosemary in their hats. Those who had passed sentence on them were now adjudged to pay them heavy damages.

All the modes by which the king had of late been in the habit of raising money were resolved to be illegal; and to secure the benefits arising from this resolution, a bill was brought in, on the 19th of January, 1641, that a parliament should be summoned every third year; and, if the crown and the proper authorities neglected to do it, the people should meet of themselves, and choose their representatives. To this bill, on the 15th of February, the king gave his assent, and the people testified their joy by bonfires and illuminations.

Petitions against episcopacy or its abuses poured in from all quarters. One, signed by two thousand of the clergy, prayed for the extinction of the order; another, to the same effect, called the Root and Branch petition, with fifteen thousand names, was presented by the citizens of London. The Scottish commissioners also, eager to set up their own religious organization, exerted themselves zealously. "Against the bishops," says Baillie, "we pray, preach, and print what we are able, most freely.....There is a world of pamphlets here.....Their utter abolition, which is the only aim of the most godly, is the knot of the question. We must have it cut by the axe of prayer." Fasts were also held, he adds, that "the Lord might join the breath of his nostrils with the endeavours of weak men to blow up a wicked and anti-scriptural church."

During all this time a committee of the commons were busily engaged in preparing heads of accusation against Strafford. To give him as little chance as possible, they bound themselves, by a kind of voluntary oath, to strict secrecy as to their proceedings. The king, on his part, in his anxiety to save him, sought to conciliate his opponents; and the lords Bristol, Essex, Bedford, Hertford, Mandeville, Savile,

and Say, were sworn into the privy council. He was even induced to take a farther step, and listen to a suggestion to "prefer some of the *grandeos* to offices at court, whereby Strafford's enemies should become his friends, and the king's desires be promoted."\* The proposed arrangement was, that the Earl of Bedford should be made treasurer; his follower, Pym (who sat for his borough of Tavistock), chancellor of the exchequer; Lord Say, master of the court of wards; Denzil Hollis, secretary of state; and Oliver St. John, solicitor-general. Hampden, it is said, was to be tutor to the prince; and others, in various ways, were to be provided for.† But, from one cause and another, these promotions did not take effect; and "the great men," adds Whitelock, "baffled thereby, became the more incensed and violent against the earl, joining with the Scots commissioners, who were implacable against him." When to this remark of one who could not well be mistaken, we add the following anecdote, it may be doubted if the men who sought Strafford's blood were such models of public virtue as their admirers make them. At the time of Strafford's apostacy, he and Pym met at Greenwich. They conversed a while on public affairs, and, as they were concluding, the latter said, "You are going to leave us, but I will never leave you while your head is upon your shoulders." This threat was uttered before Strafford had committed any greater offence than that of abandoning those with whom he had lately acted, but to whose party he had never properly belonged.

Strafford, it is not to be denied, was at heart a despot; and, therefore, if the court had not won him, he would, by natural consequence, have become the most formidable of demagogues. Attached to the crown,

\* Whitelock. The term *grandeos* is of frequent occurrence in the writings of that time; it is applied to the leading men in the parliament and army.

† "The great men," says Clarendon, with a sneer, "thought they might be able to do their country better service if they got the places and preferments, and so prevent the evil counsels which had used to spring from thence."

the grand object of his life was to render it absolute. In his presidency of the North he was arbitrary and rigorous in the extreme: but he had only the king's service in view, and he was accordingly impartial in his tyranny. When he was appointed to the government of Ireland in 1632, he went over to that "conquered country," as he styled it, fully determined to make his master, as far as it was concerned, "the most absolute prince in Christendom." The effects produced by his energy and talents were certainly surprising: at the same time that he ruled it with a rod of iron, he made it flourishing and wealthy. The customs were quadrupled in the short space of four years; for he guarded the seas, and repressed all internal commotion. In the fifth year the revenue exceeded the expenditure by £60,000. It was he who first introduced the linen-manufacture; but he suppressed that of wool, in order to keep Ireland, for this staple, dependant on England. He also formed magnificent projects of foreign trade, and sought for sources of internal industry. Confiding in the vigour of his own mind, he feared not to convene parliaments; and, when they met, he swayed them at will. He raised and maintained a numerous and well-appointed army; and he never for a moment lost sight of his main object, that of rendering the sovereign absolute.\* He declared absolute monarchy to be the best form of government; and to establish it, he laboured in concert with Laud, a man every way his inferior, no doubt, but in this matter as vehement as himself. Their favourite word was "thorough;" and they frequently complained of the scruples and slowness of their royal master, who would not proceed as rapidly as they required.†

All the preliminaries having been arranged, the day fixed for the trial of this mighty man arrived. It was

\* The "Propositions for securing of his Majesty's estate, &c.," ascribed to Strafford in the Appendix to Ludlow's Memoirs, were drawn up by Sir Dudley Carleton, and not by the earl.

† "He neither knows how to be, nor to be made great," said Laud of him very truly

the 22d of March, and the place was Westminster Hall. The Earl of Arundel acted as lord-high-steward. The peers, in their robes, were seated on benches in the centre; in the galleries erected on each side sat the commons, as a committee of their house; and with them the Scottish commissioners and the deputies sent over by a portion of the Irish house of commons, to make charges against the lord-lieutenant. At the upper end was an elevated throne, on each side of which was a latticed box for the royal family,\* and at the lower end of the throne was a gallery for ladies of quality. A bar stretched across the hall, leaving about one third of it for the use of the public.

The court commenced its session every morning at nine o'clock. The earl entered, attired in black, wearing his cross of St. George by a golden chain; and, having made three bows to the high-steward, knelt at the bar. Then, bowing to the peers, he took his place at a small desk, the lieutenant of the Tower standing beside him, and his four secretaries behind. He was subjected to every disadvantage: he was suffering from the stone and gout; according to the iniquitous practice which prevailed at that time, and long after, he was not allowed the aid of counsel, except on points of law; the witnesses against him were examined on oath, while his were not; he had but thirty minutes given him to prepare his replies to the charges urged against him by the managers; and, while he was thus engaged, a continual noise was kept up around him: the lords walking about and chatting, the commons more boisterous still, and an incessant clamour being made at the doors.† The bishops too, probably fearing for themselves, had, on the suggestion of Williams, resigned their right of being present; and the

\* The king and queen, and most of the principal persons of the court, were present during a greater part of the trial.—*Am. Ed.*

† "It was daily," says Baillie, "the most glorious assembly the isle could afford; yet the gravity not such as I expected." "After ten," he adds, "much public eating, not only of confections, but of flesh and bread, bottles of beer and wine going thick from mouth to mouth without cups, and all this in the king's eye."

king had weakly consented to allow the privy counsellors to be examined on oath by the committee respecting advice given by the earl at the board. Against these, Strafford had to sustain him, his own mighty powers, his conviction that the charges against him did not amount to treason, and the repeated assurance of the king that he should not suffer in life, honour, or fortune.

On the second day Pym rose, and "made," says Whitelock, "an introduction very rhetorical and smart to the articles." These, which were twenty-eight in number, were urged, during thirteen days, by the lawyers Glyn, Maynard, Palmer, and Whitelock. The general charge was "an endeavour to overthrow the fundamental government of the kingdom, and introduce an arbitrary power." Of the particular specifications, three alleged the treason of levying war against the king: these were, 1. Billeting soldiers on the peaceable people of Ireland, till he had made them submit to his illegal demands. 2. Raising an army in Ireland, and advising the king to employ it in bringing England into subjection. 3. Imposing a tax on the people of Yorkshire for the maintenance of his trained bands. The remaining articles, consisting of charges of hasty and imperious expressions, of oppression of individuals, and of illegal proceedings; though of no great importance separately, amounted, it was contended, to what was termed cumulative treason, as indicating his design of subverting the liberties of the country. Against all these charges Strafford defended himself with eloquence and effect; and the tide, it was soon perceptible, was turning in his favour: he won the hearts of all the ladies by his graceful and manly eloquence; and the number of his friends among the peers was visibly on the increase. Pym and his coadjutors now began to doubt whether they should be able to convict him of treason. Their first step was to ask leave, on the 10th of April, to produce an additional piece of evidence to one of the articles. Strafford claimed the same privilege; to which Glyn objected, crying out that "the prisoner

at the bar presumed to prescribe to the commons." The lords, however, thought his demand but reasonable. The committee then rose up, and shouting *Withdraw! withdraw!* "cocked their beavers," says Baillie, "in the king's sight," and withdrew in a body, in high indignation, without even appointing a day for the next meeting.

This was on Saturday; and on the Monday following Pym produced in the house of commons a copy of some notes taken by Sir Henry Vane, of the opinions delivered at the council-table on the day that the last parliament was dissolved, according to which Strafford had said that the king, having tried the affection of his people in vain, was "absolved and loose from all rule of government, and might do what power would admit;" and that he added, "you have an army in Ireland that you may employ to reduce *this* kingdom to obedience; for I am confident the Scots cannot hold out five months." The manner in which Pym obtained these notes was somewhat suspicious. The young Sir Henry Vane being on the eve of marriage, his father, who was out of town, sent him up the keys of his study and boxes, that he might get out some title-deeds which were required for making the marriage settlement. A red velvet cabinet having attracted his attention, he opened it, and there found these notes. He hastened with them to Pym, who took a copy of them, and the original was then replaced in the cabinet. Questions founded on these notes had been put to Sir Henry Vane by the committee of the commons on three occasions before the trial: on the first two he declared that he knew nothing of Strafford's project to employ the Irish army "to reduce *this* kingdom," but the third time he recollected the very words. On the trial he repeated his last evidence, but professed that he did not know whether by "this kingdom" was meant England or Scotland. All the other councillors who were examined declared that they did not recollect the words, and that there was no idea of employing the Irish army anywhere but in Scotland.

These notes, then, were the additional evidence which the managers wanted liberty to produce, and with the following view. The law (though it had often been transgressed) required two witnesses in case of treason, and there was only the single evidence of Sir Henry Vane to this point: Pym therefore "conceived those circumstances of his and young Sir Henry Vane's having seen those original results, and being ready to swear that the paper read by him was a true copy of the other, might reasonably amount to the validity of another witness!!"

Clarendon tells us that when Pym had made this disclosure to the house, young Vane got up and avouched the truth of all that he had stated, adding himself still other particulars. His father then "rose with a pretty confusion," and said that he now saw whence the questions had been derived which had surprised him so much, but owned that the copy corresponded with the notes, which he had since committed to the flames. He expressed such indignation against his son, that a motion was made "that the father might be enjoined to be friends with his son." There was, however, for a long time, a great coolness between them in public. Clarendon and others looked upon the whole as a well-acted scene, Sir Henry Vane having himself, they believed, communicated the notes out of enmity to Strafford. The cause of this enmity is said to have been the latter's having taken his second title from Raby, a place belonging to the Vanes.

Pym having failed in converting his copy of the notes into a second witness, now introduced a bill to attain the Earl of Strafford for endeavouring to subvert the liberties of the country: for they had long since resolved to employ this odious, unconstitutional course if the impeachment seemed likely to fail.\*

\* Wariston, one of the Scottish commissioners, writes on the 2d of April, "Strafford's business is yet but in the 15th article. The lower house, if they see that the king gains many of the upper house not to condemn him, will make a bill of *teinture* [attainder] and condemnation formally in their own house," &c.—See Dalrymple, ii., 117.

At a conference, therefore, with the lords, on the afternoon of this day, the copy of Vane's notes was produced; and the next day, the 13th, when the trial was resumed, they were read openly. Lord Clare, Strafford's brother-in-law, urged that "this kingdom" meant Scotland; and Strafford himself dwelt on this point, and on the variations in Vane's testimony, adding, that the evidence of four counsellors ought surely to outweigh that of one. The lord-steward then told him, if he had anything more to say in his defence, to proceed, as the house intended now to prepare to give judgment.

The earl then went over his former ground of defence, contending that nothing charged against him amounted to treason. In conclusion, he said, "It is hard to be questioned on a law which cannot be shown. Where hath this fire lain hid so many hundreds of years, without smoke to discover it, till it thus burst forth to consume me and my children? . . . If a man pass the Thames in a boat, and split himself upon an anchor, and no buoy be floating to discover it, he who owneth the anchor shall make satisfaction: but if a buoy be set there, every one passeth upon his own peril. Now where is the mark, where the tokens upon this crime, to declare it to be high treason?" He then warned the peers, for their own sakes, not to "awaken these sleeping lions" of constructive treason. "My lords," said he, in conclusion, "I have troubled you longer than I should have done, were it not for the interest of these dear pledges a saint in heaven hath left me;" here he stopped, letting fall some tears; and he then resumed, "What I forfeit myself is nothing; but that my indiscretion should extend to my posterity, woundeth me to the very soul. You will pardon my infirmity; something I should have added, but am not able; therefore, let it pass. And now, my lords, for myself, I have been, by the blessing of Almighty God, taught that the afflictions of this present life are not to be compared to the eternal weight of glory which shall be revealed hereafter. And so, my lords, even so, with all tran-



quillity of mind, I freely submit myself to your judgment; and, whether that judgment be of life or death, *te Deum laudamus!*"\* Pym and St. John spoke in reply. It is said, that when the former uttered the following words, "If this law hath not been put in execution, as he allegeth, these two hundred and forty years, it was not for want of a law, but that all that time had not bred a man bold enough to commit such crimes as these," Strafford raised his head, and looked at him fixedly; at which Pym became confused, and his memory failed him. "To humble the man," says Baillie, "God let his memory fail him a little before the end." He looked at his papers, but they were of no avail. He then briefly said that the solicitor-general, St. John, would on a future day argue some law points before them, with learning and abilities much better for that service.†

Whitelock,‡ a generous enemy, says of Strafford's defence, "Certainly never man acted such a part on such a theatre with more wisdom, constancy, and eloquence, with greater reason, judgment, and temper, and with a better grace in all his words and gestures, than this great and excellent person did; and he moved the hearts of all his auditors, some few excepted, to remorse and pity."

The commons, in the mean time, were proceeding with their bill of attainder. It was read the third time on the 21st, only fifty-nine members voting against it, in a house of two hundred and sixty-three. The

\* Let us praise thee, oh God.

† In this speech of Pym's was the following noble passage: "The law is the boundary, the measure between the king's prerogative and the people's liberty. While these move in their own orbs, they are a support and a security to one another; the prerogative a cover and a defence to the liberty of the people, and the people by their liberty enabled to be a foundation to the prerogative. But if these bounds be so removed that they enter into contestation and conflict, one of these mischiefs must ensue: if the prerogative of the king overwhelm the liberty of the people, it will be turned into tyranny; if liberty undermine the prerogative, it will grow into anarchy."

‡ Whitelock was the chairman of the committee that drew up the impeachment of Strafford.—*Am. Ed.*

most strenuous opposer of the bill was Lord Digby, son of the Earl of Bristol, a member of the committee of impeachment. "I am still the same," he said, "in my opinions and affections as unto the Earl of Strafford. I confidently believe him to be the most dangerous minister, the most insupportable to free subjects that can be characterized. I believe him to be still that grand apostate to the commonwealth who must not expect to be pardoned in this world till he be despatched to the other. And yet let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, my hand must not be to that despatch." For this speech Digby was immediately questioned in the house; and, when he printed it, the house ordered that it should be burned by the hangman; "which," says May, "was the visible cause of his deserting the parliament, and proving so great an actor against it."\*

The bill was carried up to the lords the same day, and, as an inducement to them to pass it, there was added a proviso, that it should not be held a precedent for future times. On the 24th, the tardy peers were called on to appoint a day for reading it; and, on the 29th, Strafford being placed at the bar, St. John plead for two hours in proof of the legality of the attainder. Among other arguments, he employed the following: "He that would not have had others to have had a law, why should he have any law himself? It's true we give laws to hares and deers, because they be beasts of chase; it was never accounted either cruelty or foul play to knock foxes or wolves on the head, as they can be found, because these be beasts of prey. The warrener sets traps for polecats and other vermin, for preservation of the warren." In other words, Strafford, with law or without, must be destroyed.

Two days after, on the 1st of May, the king summoned both houses, and told them that, in conscience,

\* There is reason, however, to think that Digby had been already gained by the court, as a copy of an important paper which had been subtracted during the trial was found in the king's cabinet at Naseby, in the handwriting of Digby.

he could not condemn Strafford of treason, or assent to the bill of attainder; "but for misdemeanours, he is so clear in them, that he thinks the earl hereafter not fit to serve him or the commonwealth in any place of trust, no, not so much as a constable;" and he conjured the lords to find out some middle way. Charles, by this address, characteristic of his usual want of judgment, only hastened the fate of Strafford: for the commons, seeing their advantage, exclaimed loudly against the breach of privilege committed by the king's interfering with a bill in progress. The next day being Sunday, the pulpits which were occupied by the Puritan clergy inculcated "the necessity of justice upon some great delinquents now to be acted;" and on the following morning there came a rabble of about six thousand persons, armed with swords, daggers, and clubs, crying for justice on the Earl of Strafford, and complaining that "they were undone for the want of execution on him, trading was so decayed thereby." They insulted several of the lords, and posted up the names of the fifty-nine members of the commons who had voted against the attainder: calling them "Straffordians, or Betrayers of their Country." When these members complained to the house of being thus proscribed, they could obtain no redress: it being, they were told, the act of a multitude. If it be asked, Where did the multitude get their list? the reply will appear in the sequel.

While the mob were shouting outside, Pym took occasion to reveal to the house sundry matters which had come to his knowledge respecting intrigues and designs against the parliament; and, on his motion, a protestation (borrowed from the Covenant) to defend the Protestant church, his majesty's person and power, the privileges of parliament, and the lawful rights and liberties of the people, was solemnly assented to by all the members. It was transmitted the next day to the lords, where it was adopted in like manner: the Catholic peers, of course, declining it, and being thereby prevented from voting on Strafford's attainder.

Orders were then given that this protestation should in like manner be sworn to throughout England.

The important matter which Pym now communicated to the house was what is called the Army Plot. It is said that he had possessed a knowledge of it for some time, and had dropped hints of it, in order to produce the effects he desired in the city. The matter is involved in great obscurity, but the following is what appears to be the most probable account.

The parliament had been very regular in their payments of the money promised to their "dear brethren," as they termed the Scots. On one occasion the latter wrote up, pretending an instant need of £25,000, and the commons, having only £15,000 in hand, took, to make up the amount, £10,000 from a sum of £50,000 which was to have gone to the English army. Some of the field-officers of this army, namely, Lord Percy, brother of the Earl of Northumberland, Wilmot, son of Lord Wilmot, and colonels Ashburnham, Pollard, and others, were members of the house of commons; and Wilmot rose and said, "that, if such papers of the Scots could procure moneys, he doubted not but the officers of the English would soon do the like." Petitioning being now so much in vogue, these officers formed themselves into a *juncto*, as it was called, and prepared a petition to the king and parliament, to be presented from the army, of which the prayer was, the preserving of the bishops' functions and votes, the non-disbanding of the Irish army until that of the Scots should also be disbanded, and the settlement of the royal revenue. This was communicated by Percy to the king. Meanwhile, there was a plot on foot between Henry Jermyn, master of the horse to the queen, Sir John Suckling, George Goring, son of Lord Goring, and others, the object of which was deeper: it being no less than to bring up the army and overawe the parliament. It would appear that not only the queen, but the king even, was acquainted with this design, for he commanded Percy and his friends to communicate with Jermyn and Goring. They had three meetings; and Goring, find-

ing that the more violent courses which he urged were not relished, and seeing also that the command of the army, the object of his ambition, would not be bestowed on him, went and made a discovery of the whole scheme to Lord Newport, and then to the parliamentary leaders. Percy, Jermyn, and Suckling, finding the affair divulged, fled to France : the others stood their ground. Percy afterward, on the 14th of June, wrote a letter to his brother, giving an account (apparently a true one) of the whole affair ; and then Wilmot, Ashburnham, and Pollard were committed to custody. Lord Digby, for asserting that Goring was a perjured man, was expelled the house, and Goring was voted to have done nothing contrary to justice and honour.

The king, in his extreme anxiety to save Strafford, may have lent a willing ear to the wild project of Goring : he also assented to another, for introducing one Captain Billingsley, with two hundred men, into the Tower with that design, and gave his warrant for it. But Balfour, the lieutenant, a Scotsman, suspecting their object, refused to admit them. It is also said that Balfour was tempted with a sum of money to suffer the earl to escape ; and, on his examination, he swore that Strafford had offered him a bribe of £20,000, besides promising him " a good marriage for his son," to the same end.\*

On the 5th a bill was introduced into the commons which virtually dissolved the monarchy. There being a difficulty in raising funds for the pay of the army, a Lancashire knight engaged to obtain £650,000 if the king would pass a bill " not to prorogue, adjourn, or dissolve this parliament without consent of both houses, to endure till the grievances were redressed, and to give the parliament credit to take up moneys." The next day a bill founded on this proposal was hurried through all its stages, and sent,

\* As this was sworn (June 2d) after Strafford's death, we have only Balfour's word for its truth. May (p. 65) says the match proposed was the earl's own daughter.

with that of the attainder, up to the other house. The lords wished to limit it to two years, but the commons would not consent, and on the 8th it was passed. The lords at the same time passed the bill of attainder, the judges having previously declared that on two of the articles the earl was guilty of treason. This opinion would have been of more weight if the judges had not so recently experienced the power of the commons. Various causes concurring to induce several of the peers to absent themselves, there were but forty-five present when the bill was passed, and of these nineteen voted against it.

The two bills were now sent to the king. In his distress of mind he summoned some of the prelates and privy counsellors to his aid. Some urged the authority of the judges; and Bishop Williams is said to have drawn a pernicious distinction between a king's private and public conscience, by which, in his public capacity, he might do that which he secretly believed to be wrong. Bishop Juxon alone, we are told, honestly advised him to act according to his convictions. A letter also came from the earl himself, urging him to assent to the bill. "Sir," said he in it, "my consent shall more acquit you herein to God than all the world can do besides. To a willing man there is no injury done." A truly noble mind would have perished sooner than sacrifice such a willing victim: but Charles, to his ultimate ruin and indelible disgrace, signed a commission to three lords authorizing them to pass both the bills.\*

It is probable that Strafford did not look for this result: for, when Secretary Carleton came from the king to inform him of what he had done, and his motives for it, he could not at first believe it. When satisfied

\* The commons, on a similar occasion, showed themselves more generous. When, with a view to embarrassing the king, they petitioned for the execution of one Goodman and other popish priests, Goodman petitioned the house, praying that he might be executed rather than be the occasion of difference between them and the king. Charles left the matter to the house, and none were executed.

of the truth, he stood up, lifted his eyes to heaven, and, laying his hand on his heart, said, "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sons of men, for in them there is no salvation."\*

Denzil Hollis, who was Strafford's brother-in-law, told Burnet that the king sent for him, and asked if he knew of any course to save his life. Hollis hinted at a reprieve, which would give himself time to use his influence with his friends in the commons. The king would appear to have assented to this course; but, with his usual inconstancy, he adopted another. The day after his assent to the bill, the 11th, he sent a letter by the young Prince of Wales, written by himself, to the lords, urging them to join him in prevailing with the commons to consent to his imprisonment for life: "but," he subjoined, "if no less than his life can satisfy my people, I must say *Fiat justitia*." In a postscript, he adds, "If he must die, it were charity to reprieve him till Saturday." This postscript is said to have sealed the earl's doom.†

The following morning, the 12th, was appointed for the execution. The scaffold was erected on Tower Hill; when ready, the earl left his chamber; Laud, as he had requested, was at his window, to give him his

\* Strafford might well have been surprised at the king's conduct, after having received a letter from him only a few days before containing these words: "I cannot satisfy honour or conscience without assuring you, now in the midst of all your troubles, that, *upon the word of a king, you shall not suffer in life, honour, or fortune*." And upon this promise the earl, a few days only before his condemnation, wrote to his wife thus: "I know at the worst his majesty will pardon without hurting my fortune, and then I shall be happy. Therefore comfort yourself, for I trust these clouds will pass away, and that we shall have fair weather afterward." It is but fair, however, to consider the condition in which Charles was placed. The commons and people were clamorous for the execution of his favourite; he was threatened with insurrection and civil war; reports of domestic conspiracy and foreign invasion were industriously circulated; and the terrified queen besought her husband with tears to consult the safety of his family. When he finally signed the death-warrant, he is reported to have said, "My Lord of Strafford's condition is more enviable than mine."—*Am. Ed.*

† Burnet, *Own Times*, i., 56, where see the editor's note.

blessing as he passed; the feeble old man raised his hands, but was unable to speak, and fell back into the arms of his attendants. The earl moved on; and the lieutenant desired him to take a coach at the gate, lest the mob should tear him in pieces: to which he replied, that it was indifferent to him whether he died by the axe or by their fury. The multitude extended far as the eye could reach; the earl took off his hat several times and saluted them; not a word of insult was heard; "his step and air," says Rushworth, who was present, "were those of a general marching at the head of an army to breathe victory, rather than those of a condemned man to undergo the sentence of death." From the scaffold he addressed the people, assuring them that he had always had the welfare of his country at heart: it augured ill for their happiness, he told them, to write the commencement of a reformation in letters of blood; and he declared that he had never been against parliaments, regarding them as "the best means, under God, to make the king and his people happy." He turned to take leave of his friends; and, seeing his brother weeping, he gently reproved him. "Think," said he, "that you are now accompanying me the fourth time to my marriage-bed. That block shall be my pillow, and here I shall rest from all my labours." He then began to undress, saying, "I do as cheerfully put off my doublet at this time as ever I did when I went to bed." He knelt and prayed, Archbishop Usher and another clergyman kneeling with him. He laid down his head to try the block: then telling the executioner that he would stretch forth his hands as a sign when he was to strike, he laid it finally down, and, giving the signal, it was severed at a single blow; and thus, in the forty-ninth year of his age, perished Thomas earl of Strafford, "who, for natural parts and abilities," says Whitelock, "and for improvement of knowledge, by experience in the greatest affairs, for wisdom, faithfulness, and gallantry of mind, hath left few behind him that may be ranked equal with him."\*

\* "He died justly before God and man," says Hallam, "though  
VOL. III.—Y



We have been thus minute in our account of the trial and death of this distinguished man, because we think it affords an index to the motives and conduct of the popular leaders. These are judged, even at the present day, more by feeling and prejudice than by reason; and while the admirers of republican principles see in Pym and his coadjutors a species of demi-gods, men raised far above all selfish objects and private feelings, the advocates of kingly power regard them as mere factious demagogues, anxious only to destroy the monarchy. Here too, as elsewhere, the truth lies between. Pym and his friends were politicians and statesmen; and it is not among such that any one versed in history and human nature will often look for perfect virtue. They had noble objects in view, no doubt: it was a glorious task to build up a barrier against despotism, and thus secure to the nation civil and religious liberty. But, in the attainment of these objects, they were not sufficiently scrupulous as to means; and, while hastening after justice, they at times trampled it under their feet. In the prosecution of Strafford it is easy to discern a feeling of personal vindictiveness, only to be satisfied by his blood, and which no security against his return to power would have appeased.\* It was this which led

we may deem the precedent dangerous, and the better course of a magnanimous lenity unwisely rejected; and in condemning the 'bill of attainder, we cannot look upon it as a crime." Much as we respect this writer, we cannot agree with these sentiments; we think there is something of crime in inflicting a greater penalty where a less might serve, and in taking life where no positive law had been transgressed. "Nothing," says Fox (*Hist. of James II.*, p. 10), in the spirit of true political wisdom, "but a case of clear self-defence can justify a departure from the sacred principles of justice; but, whenever an individual can be brought to trial, he is within the power of his prosecutors; and, therefore, when there has been no law distinctly provided against the species of offence of which he is accused, the present delinquent should be allowed to escape, and a legislative enactment be made to meet the crime in future."

\* Clarendon (*Life*, iii., 232) ascribes the death of Strafford chiefly to the animosity of the Scots, "and this fury of them," he adds, "met with a full concurrence from those of the English who could not compass their own ends without their help."

them, when distrusting their power of convicting him legally of treason, to bring in their fatal bill of attainder. As for the conduct of the king on this occasion, we have no excuse to offer for it. If faithless to his country, Strafford had been but too faithful to him; and, as a stand was to be made somewhere, it might far more honourably be made in defence of the life of a man whom he believed to be innocent, than in the support of his despotic power in church and state. But Charles never in reality loved the earl, and the queen is thought to have urged him to sacrifice him.

This important trial also reveals to us the skill of the popular leaders in raising and sustaining what is now termed a "pressure from without." The following were the instruments principally employed. 1. The *press*, whence issued swarms of pamphlets, answering to the "leading articles" in newspapers of our days, which, as Baxter tells us, "were greedily bought up throughout the land, which greatly increased the people's apprehension of their danger." 2. The *pulpit*. This had been too frequently diverted from its legitimate purpose to serve political ends. The patriots and Puritans had often and justly complained of its being employed to inculcate the doctrines of passive obedience: and still, in the day of their own power, they recognised its efficacy, and hesitated not to make use of it unsparingly. The clergy attended the parliament, and there received their instructions; and the congregations learned from the pulpit what they should do in support of their leaders in the commons. 3. *Petitions*, which gave opportunity for large bodies of people to approach the house, often armed, and thus to daunt the opponents of the popular cause. These petitions were frequently drawn up in London and sent down to the country to be subscribed;\* and, if we may

\* See Dugdale, Short View, p. 66.

"The parliament drew up petitions  
To itself, and sent them, like commissions,  
To well-affected persons down,  
In every city and great town,  
With power to levy horse and men,  
Only to bring them back again."

*Hudibras*, p. i., c. ii., 610.

believe Clarendon, a scandalous artifice was sometimes employed. A moderate petition would be read at a public meeting, to which few could refuse to subscribe: but, after the signatures were obtained, a petition of a very different character would be placed at the head of it, and thus people often found themselves supplicants for what they had no mind to. 4. *Rumours*. At various times since the meeting of parliament it had been reported that the Catholics were assembling in arms secretly in Surrey, and openly in Lancashire, and, ridiculously enough, that there was a plot for blowing up the Thames, and thus drowning the city, on the supposed discovery of which there was a public thanksgiving; that there was another also for blowing up the house of commons with gunpowder, and that Sir John Earle had actually smelt the powder. The report of this spread to the city; the drums beat, and the train-bands and crowds of the people hastened to Westminster to protect the members. A tailor, sitting under a hedge, heard two soldiers talking of how some of their comrades were to get so much a piece for killing several of the lords and commons; one night the citizens started from their beds and flew to arms, on a report that the king was coming down with horse and foot. We are told that, in the space of two or three months, these reports amounted to not less than thirty-nine. 5. *Spies*. Pym is said to have had an understanding with Lady Carlisle, through whom he learned all that was passing in the royal apartments; and, according to Clarendon, "all tavern and ordinary discourses" were carried to him. 6. And lastly, *organized mobs* of the London apprentices and others.

## CHAPTER VI.

## CHARLES I. (CONTINUED).

1641, 1642.

Change of Ministry.—Army-petition.—Attacks on the Church.—Charles in Scotland.—The Incident.—The Irish Rebellion and Massacre.—Return of the King.—The Remonstrance.—Proceedings of the Parliament.—The Five Members.—Petitions to Parliament.—King retires to the North.—Encroachments of the Commons.—The Militia.

AFTER the fall of Strafford, the king seems to have abandoned all thoughts of farther resistance for the present. The plan of granting office to some of the leading patriots had been resumed; but, unhappily for him, the Earl of Bedford, an honourable and moderate man, who would have engaged to save Strafford, died at this very conjuncture. It was, however, partially carried into effect, Lord Say being made master of the court of wards, Essex lord-chamberlain, Hertford governor to the prince, and Leicester lord-lieutenant of Ireland. Bishop Juxon resigned his office of lord-treasurer, to which the influence of Laud had advanced him, but in which his conduct had been irreproachable; and the treasury was put into commission.\*

The act securing them from a dissolution having now set the parliament somewhat more at their ease, they felt the less necessity for keeping the Scottish army in the kingdom; and they began now to think

\* The influence of Laud had procured him this office in pursuance of his plan of making the church what it had been in the state. "Now if the church will not uphold themselves under God, I can do no more," is the reflection this ill-judging man makes on this occasion in his Diary; and he writes to Strafford, "We begin to live here in the church triumphant; and there wants but one more to keep the king's conscience [i. e., to be chancellor] to make up a triumvirate."

seriously of disbanding both that and the English forces. In the month of February they had voted a sum of £300,000 "towards a supply of the losses and necessities of their brethren of Scotland." There were, moreover, £120,000 of arrears due the Scots. The mode of payment was arranged; and, in addition to six subsidies, it was proposed to raise a supply by means of a graduated poll-tax: a duke, for instance, being rated at £100, men of £100 a year at £5, &c. The English army was to be paid off in like manner; and the Earl of Holland was appointed to its command, with a view to disband it.

While Holland remained in London, the command lay with Sir Jacob Ashly. The king, ever anxious to regain his power, listened to another project for marching up the army to overawe the parliament. It was proposed to proceed in the usual way by petition, and one was accordingly drawn up, to be presented to the king and parliament in the name of the officers and soldiers; in which, after enumerating and praising all the late measures of reform, they complain that there are certain "stirring and practical" persons whom nothing short of the subversion of the government would satisfy, and who overawed the parliament by means of mobs; "for the suppressing of which," it proceeds, "in all humility we offer ourselves to wait upon you, if you please, hoping we shall appear as considerable in the way of defence to our gracious sovereign, the parliament, our religion, and the established laws of the kingdom, as what number soever shall audaciously presume to violate them," etc.

This petition was read and approved of by the king, in token of which he wrote his C. R.\* at the bottom of it. It was then sent down to the army by Captain Legg, with directions not to show it to any one but Sir Jacob Ashly. The chief agent employed by the king in this affair was one Daniel O'Neal, an Irish Catholic, who had served abroad, and was now sergeant-major (i. e., adjutant) in the regiment of Sir

\* The initials of Charles Rex, or Charles the King.

John Conyers, and who was also engaged to treat with the Scottish army for their neutrality. The plan, however, proved abortive; and, soon coming to the knowledge of the parliament, it greatly augmented their distrust of the king.\*

On the 22d of June, the commons presented to the king an act granting him tonnage and poundage, and also one for the poll-money. These were accompanied by two others, for suppressing the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission. The king came down on the 2d of July, and signed the money-bills, but demurred to the others. Learning, however, how much dissatisfaction this had produced, he came again on the 5th and passed the other two bills: thus, in his usual unhappy manner, foregoing the credit he might have gained by a prompt and cheerful compliance with what he could not avoid.

The king's attachment to his sister and her family is an amiable trait in his character; and his anxiety for the recovery of the palatinate led him into negotiations and civilities with the pope and the Catholic princes, which caused alarm to his more zealous Protestant subjects. He now, with the hearty concurrence of the parliament, prepared a manifesto on that subject, which Sir Thomas Roe was directed to present to the emperor at the approaching diet at Ratisbon. Another act which had given much satisfaction to the people, as a proof of his Protestant feeling, was the betrothal of his daughter Mary (now, however, only in her tenth year) to the Prince of Orange, which had been solemnized at Whitehall on the 2d of May. Had Charles, indeed, been inclined to rule as a constitutional monarch, the path was now plain before him to the hearts of his people.

The historian May observes, that the parliament had at this time lost much of its popularity. This he ascribes to different causes: to their *lifting-at* the bish-

\* Great confusion has arisen from jumbling, as Clarendon does, this with the former army-plot. He heedlessly assigns this petition to the former; and as, in such case, it contains anachronisms, Mr. Brodie boldly accuses him of forging it.

ops, which turned the universities and most of the clergy against them; to their not checking the rabble, who frequently disturbed the church service, and tore the books and surplices, they being, he says, "either too much busied in a variety of affairs, or, perchance, too much fearing the loss of a considerable party whom they might have need of against a real and potent enemy;" and to the reports of the preachings of tradesmen and other illiterate persons of the lowest rank. Others, again, were disappointed that political miracles had not been performed, and were alienated by the heavy taxes that had been imposed. He appears to agree in opinion also with those who thought that the parliament greatly injured their cause by mixing religion so much with it.\*

It is necessary that the reader should here be informed of the proceedings of the parliament up to this period, in relation to religion. On the presentation of the "Root and Branch" petition, it was carried by a small majority to refer it to the committee of religion. Sir Edward Dering, an honest, dull man, then brought in a bill for the abolition of episcopacy; and, though we are assured that very few of the members desired any such thing, the second reading was carried by 139 to 108. Hyde, however, the chairman of the committee, gave it so much interruption that no progress was made in it; and petitions, numerous signed, were presented from various counties, praying that episcopacy and the liturgy might be reformed, but not abolished. In July the house voted in favour of a scheme of Archbishop Usher's, for making every county a diocese, with a presbytery of twelve divines, presided over by a bishop, who should, with them, have authority "to ordain, suspend, deprive, degrade, and excommunicate." On this occasion also, some members maintained that it was unlawful for bishops to sit in parliament. As the lords were disinclined to any measure of this nature, and the bishops stood their

\* It may, however, be doubted if, either at this time or in 1688, the assertors of the public liberties could have succeeded without the aid of religion.

ground firmly, on the 4th of August articles of impeachment, on account of the late canons, were exhibited against one half of the bench. The prelates, however, did not shrink; they merely required time and counsel to prepare their answer, which was granted. The commons had already, on the 5th of July, voted Wren, bishop of Ely, "unworthy and unfit to hold or exercise any office or dignity in the church or commonwealth;" and he had been committed to the Tower. They moreover passed an order, which Sir Robert Harlowe was empowered to execute, "to take away all scandalous pictures, crosses, and figures within churches and without;" and the "zealous knight," we are told, "took down the cross in Cheapside, Charing Cross, and others the like monuments, impartially."

The Irish army had been already disbanded; on the 6th of August, the English and Scottish armies were disbanded also; "and the Scots, with store of English money and spoils," says Whitelock, "and the best entertainment, left their warm and plentiful quarters." On the 10th, the king himself set out for Scotland, and travelled with such speed that he reached Edinburgh in four days. He was followed thither by a committee of the commons, composed of Lord Howard of Escrick, Mr. Fiennes, Mr. Hampden, and Sir William Armyn, to watch his proceedings, and "to preserve the good intercourse and understanding which was begun between the two nations." Before he departed he had signed a bill, making the Earl of Essex general of his forces on this side of the Trent. Parliament continued to sit till the 9th of September, when it adjourned to the 20th of October, after appointing a committee of fifty to sit during the recess.

It was the hope of regaining his power which had induced Charles to visit Scotland, where there was an individual able and willing to execute the most daring projects, and who was now wholly devoted to him. This was the Earl of Montrose, who, in disgust at the king's neglect of him at the time of his coronation, had joined the covenanters: but, becoming offended



with these for preferring Argyle to him in civil affairs, and Lesley in military, he was now secretly devoted to the king, to whom he made important disclosures. Having been detected in a plot, he was then a prisoner in the castle of Edinburgh. By means of William Murray of the bedchamber, he corresponded with the king, and infused into his mind suspicions (whether well or ill grounded is hard to say) of Argyle and even of Hamilton. According to Clarendon, who had the account from the king himself, "he informed him of many particulars from the beginning of the rebellion, and that the marquis was no less faulty and false towards his majesty than Argyle; and offered to make proof of all in the parliament, but rather desired to kill them both, which he frankly undertook to do; but the king, abhorring that expedient, for his own security, advised that the proofs might be prepared for the parliament."

It would seem that, on account of the great power and influence of these noblemen, the king consented to the employment of stratagem for their arrest. The plan is said to have been, that Argyle, Hamilton, and his brother Lord Lanark, should be invited to the royal drawing-room on Sunday, October the 2d, where they should be arrested as traitors, and handed over to Lord Crawford, who was to be at hand with a party of soldiers. They were then to be placed in a close carriage, and hurried on board a frigate which lay in Leith roads, where they were to be kept till their trial. It is added, that, if they should attempt resistance, they were to be put to death. The accused, however, had been informed of the plan to entrap them the evening before, and absented themselves from court. The next morning they wrote to the king and parliament, assigning the reasons for their withdrawal, and then went out of town, and finally retired to Glasgow. As the letters of the Hamiltons were "not without some reflections on his majesty," Charles insisted on their submitting to a public trial. It was finally, however, thought best for all parties that the trial should be before a private committee, of which the members should be sworn to secrecy.

This event is named the "Incident." Like so many other events in Scottish history, it is enveloped in an obscurity which will never, perhaps, be totally dissipated. The plot for the arrest, however, seems to be proved, but what the exact object of the king was it is difficult to say. It may have been part of a plan to overawe the Scottish parliament, or Charles may have hoped by this means to come at the proofs, which he knew existed, of the invitation sent to the Scots by the popular leaders at Westminster to enter England, and on which he might found a charge of treason against them. When the account of the Incident was transmitted to London by the committee, the parliament felt or affected great consternation; and they applied to the Earl of Essex for a guard to protect them.

In the midst of these alarms tidings reached the king and parliament of the breaking out of a most sanguinary rebellion in Ireland. The causes which produced this horrible explosion had long been in secret operation: we will here briefly enumerate them.\*

The Irish were at this time in an exceedingly rude and barbarous state, and their hatred was intense towards the English nation, name, and religion. The territory of an Irish sept or clan was somewhat of the nature of an Indian hunting-ground: no one had any particular possession in it, and every death in the sept caused a new arrangement. Tillage, therefore, could only be in scanty patches, and the native Irish actually moved about with their herds like the Eastern Turkmans. Still this rude kind of possession was property, and it galled them to lose it. In their eyes, the proportions which had been regranted them on English tenures were not of equal value, and they little prized the civilization which had been thus introduced. This was the case in three of the provinces. There had been no English plantations as yet in Connaught, and no insurrections; and here, in the last two reigns, the Irish proprietors had surrendered their es-

\* The principal authority for the following details is the narrative of Sir John Temple, who was master of the rolls at the time in Ireland.

tates to the crown, to receive them back by a legal tenure. These grants (though the fees were paid) had not been enrolled in chancery, and Charles, on ascending the throne, was urged to take advantage of the neglect, and declare the whole province forfeited. He was prepared to do so: but he afterward agreed to take £120,000, payable in three years, for some *graces*, as they were called, which he was to bestow, and the chief object of which was to secure both the Irish and English in their lands against the crown. A parliament was to be held to confirm these *graces*, and the deputy issued the writs; but, as it had been done in an irregular manner, they were declared void in England. The three years thus passed away, the money was all paid, and the *graces* had not been confirmed; still the king threatened to straiten them if the contribution were not continued. Strafford was now sent over, and he ruled with despotic sway; the *graces* were rudely denied, and juries were forced to find the king's title to the lands throughout Connaught. Affairs in Scotland and England prevented anything being done in the way of plantation, and in the committee which went over to accuse Strafford, both parties united in the effort to induce the king to perform his promises. He did consent in May, 1641, but the Irish parliament having been prorogued, they had not been legally confirmed when the rebellion broke out.

The plan of insurrection is said to have originated with Roger Moore, one of the sept whose territory had been formed into the counties of King and Queen in the reign of Mary.\* Moore had served abroad in the Spanish armies, and it appeared to him that what had succeeded in Scotland might also be achieved in Ire-

\* The condition of Ireland was doubtless most wretched at this time; and it seems equally certain that it was in a great degree made so, as has at all times been the case, by the injustice and oppression of England. This circumstance is to be taken into account in estimating the character and causes of those sanguinary revolts so frequent in the history of this much-wronged country; not for the purpose of justifying the enormities that were committed, but in some measure to extenuate and account for them.—*Am. Ed.*

land: and that, by a simultaneous rising of the Catholics of both races, by seizing the forts, and expelling the English and Scottish colonists, they might recover their lands and re-establish their religion. It does not appear to have been any part of his plan that they should cast off their allegiance to the king. Moore went secretly to Lord MacGuire, Sir Phelim O'Neal, and other chieftains in the North, and he also communicated with the lords of the Pale.\* As some of these last were of the committee in London, it is highly probable that the queen may have known of and favoured a design for setting up the religion to which she was devoted in Ireland; and it is also possible enough that Charles himself, over whom her influence was now unbounded, may have listened to a project which held forth to him a prospect of recovering his darling arbitrary power. It is utterly incredible, however, that he should have given his assent to any plan for expelling the English: still he might have preferred seeing the government in the hands of the Catholics rather than in those of a party which he knew to be devoted to the parliament. Charles had, indeed, so great a fondness for intrigue, and was in the habit of listening to so many different opinions, and adopting such a variety of expedients for attaining his objects, that one can rarely venture to deny with confidence any charge alleged against him.

The plot, though communicated to a great number of persons, had been kept profoundly secret. A principal object was to get possession of the castle of Dublin, in which were the arms of the late army, and large stores of ammunition. For this purpose it was arranged that Roger Moore, Lord MacGuire, Hugh MacMahon, Hugh Byrne, and other gentlemen, with twenty men from each county, should come up to the capital, and that the attempt should be made on the 23d of October. It was only on the night of the preceding day that the lords justices got information of

\* The Pale was the district round Dublin. Its lords, Gormanstown, Fingal, and others, were all of English blood.

what was intended, and then by the merest chance. There was a man of Irish origin, but who had lived chiefly among the English, and was of the Protestant religion, whose name was Owen O'Conolly; and, for what reason is not known, MacMahon wished to engage him in the plot. He therefore wrote to him to come to his house, in the county of Monaghan, without delay. On Conolly's arriving there, he found that MacMahon had gone up to Dublin, whither he followed him, and arrived at six o'clock in the evening of Friday the 22d. MacMahon took him to Lord MacGuire's, and there informed him of the whole plan for a simultaneous rising, at ten o'clock the next morning, to destroy the English throughout the kingdom. Conolly told him it could not succeed, and urged him to discover the plot, and thus save his estate: but he refused, and swore that Conolly should not leave his lodging (whither they had returned) that night. After drinking with him for some time, Conolly got his permission to go down to the yard; and, leaving his sword behind him, went out, attended by MacMahon's man. He then jumped over the wall, and made all haste to the house of Sir William Parsons, one of the lords justices. It was about nine o'clock when he came with information of the conspiracy. As Conolly was somewhat affected by what he had drunk, he delivered his account in so confused a manner that Parsons gave but little credit to it. He therefore desired him to go back to MacMahon, and learn what more he could. In the mean time, he himself, having given directions for securing the castle gates, went to his colleague Sir John Borlase, and they sent for such of the council as were in town. Conolly, who had been seized by the watch, and would have been carried to prison had not one of Parsons's servants fortunately come up at the time, was brought in; and, being now tolerably sober, gave a full account of all he had discovered. Before day came MacMahon was arrested. He did not attempt to deny the plot: but told the council that "what was to be done in other parts of the country was so far advanced at that time

as it was impossible for the wit of man to prevent it," and that he was sure to be avenged if he suffered any evil. The Lord MacGuire and some others were also arrested: but Moore, Byrne, and the rest obtained timely information, and so escaped.

MacMahon's assertions were soon verified. Lord Blaney arrived at midnight, on the 24th, with tidings of his own house and family at Castle Blaney, in the county of Monaghan, and two other strong houses in the same county, having been surprised that morning by the rebels; and, in three hours after, news came of the Irish in the Newry having broken open the king's store there and seized the ammunition. That same day (Sunday) Lord Gormanstown and the other Catholic lords of the Pale came, making great professions of loyalty, and craving to be supplied with arms. The next day, the 25th, the justices wrote an account to the Earl of Leicester of what had taken place. Owen O'Conolly was the bearer of the letter, and he was properly recommended to the royal bounty.

We shall now proceed to relate the progress of the rebellion. The main object of the rebels, as we have seen, was to root out the English from the country. It is said that they had debated whether they should do this after the fashion set by the court of Spain in the case of the Moors, and merely expel them, or whether they should fall upon and slaughter them. It is probable that Roger Moore, and the more enlightened and humane, were for the former course, while Sir Phelim O'Neal and the priests, especially the friars, were for destruction and massacre. Nothing, however, would seem to have been decided on, and all were left to act as they judged best. On the 22d (Friday), the priests in several places in Ulster, it is said, dismissed the people with directions to go and take possession of their lands; and the next morning they assembled in great numbers, armed with staves, scythes, and pitchforks, and began to drive away the cattle of the English settlers, and then to break into their houses and seize their goods. Some houses were burned, and some of the English murdered on this first

day of the outbreak. They soon proceeded to still greater extremities: they stripped them, men, women, and children, naked, and turned them out of their houses. The Irish were forbidden to give them food or relief of any kind as they passed along; and the rags which they had procured to cover them were torn off by the women and children that they met on their way.

The expulsion of the English was greatly facilitated by the manner in which they lived intermixed among the Irish, with whom also they had in some cases intermarried. Many of them had Irish tenants and servants, and many were themselves tenants to the Irish gentry, who preferred them, as able to pay better rents than their own people. Hence they did not assemble themselves together in bodies, and stand on their defence, as had the Scots, but each remained in his own house, relying on his Irish friends, neighbours, landlords, tenants, or servants, to protect him. But they experienced only cruelty and treachery; those on whom they depended having been instructed by their priests that it was sinful to show mercy to heretics.

The most shocking barbarities were therefore perpetrated on this occasion. Some of the English they buried alive; others they suspended by the arms, and cut them with their swords till they died. Multitudes were shut up in houses, to which fire was set, and they were thus burned alive. At Belturbet and Portadown, the Protestants were forced by hundreds into the river, and there drowned. Nay, it is asserted that, by a horrid refinement of cruelty, wives and children were in some cases induced, by a promise of their lives, to be the executioners of their husbands and parents, and when they had thus violated the laws of nature, they themselves were slaughtered. Our blood congeals as we read the depositions of those who escaped out of the hands of these wretches after witnessing their diabolical deeds. The women were even more sanguinary than the men; the very children lent their aid in the work of blood; the friars,

with tears, exhorted the people to save none of the English; priests gave the sacrament to their penitents on condition of their sparing neither man, woman, nor child; and excommunication was fulminated against those who should dare relieve any of the stripped and ruined Protestants.

Though Ulster was the earliest and principal theatre of these barbarities, they were not confined to it; and similar scenes were enacted in the other three provinces, and even in the counties adjoining the capital. The county of Kilkenny and Queen's county seem to have been most abundant in deeds of cruelty in Leinster. The whole number of those who perished has been variously estimated. The number said to have been returned by the priests in Ulster, from their several parishes, down to April, 1642, was 105,000; and Archdeacon Maxwell, in his deposition taken on the 22d of August, stated, that there were "above 154,000 now wanting within the very precinct of Ulster." The general impression in England was, that, in one way or another, 200,000 Protestants perished in this rebellion.\*

The king, on receiving intelligence of the insurrection in Ireland, referred the whole matter to the parliament of England, which had already voted a supply of £50,000 for its suppression, and taken other needful measures. The Earl of Ormond was appointed lieutenant-general of the forces in Ireland: but these were too few to check the progress of the Ulster insurgents, who soon advanced and laid siege to Drogheda. When the Irish parliament met, the Catholic members were very gentle in their condemnation of the rebellion,† and in little more than a month from the time of the first outbreak, the Lord Gormanstown and the other Catholics of the Pale were in arms on the side of the rebels.

Charles now prepared to leave Scotland. To con-

\* See Appendix (B).

† They objected to the term *rebels*, styling them merely *discontented gentlemen*. At length they consented to the words *traitorous and rebellious actions* of some persons.



ciliate the nobles, he lavished the church-lands and places and honours on them. Argyle was made a marquis, Loudon an earl and chancellor, Lesley and Munro earls of Leven and Callender; Johnston of Warriston was raised to the bench, and the livings of Henderson and others were increased. In return, the safety of Montrose and his friends was assured, and ten thousand men were promised for the recovery of the Palatinate. Old Lesley, we are told by Clarendon, assured the king "that he could not only never more serve against him, but that, whenever his majesty would require his service, he should have it, without ever asking what the cause was." Others, he adds, whispered to him, "that as soon as the troubles of the late storm could be perfectly calmed, they would reverse and repeal whatsoever was now unreasonably extorted from him." Charles therefore quitted his native kingdom with good hopes that he had at least neutralized it in the struggle which he was preparing to make for the recovery of his despotic power in England. Towards the end of November he returned to London, where, as we have seen, there had been some reaction in the popular feeling in his favour, and Sir Richard Gournay, the lord-mayor of that year, was a royalist. A magnificent civic banquet was given to the monarch at Guildhall on the 25th of November, and the streets rang with acclamations of loyalty as he passed to and from it. The king and his friends were unduly elated by these marks of popular favour, and their conduct stimulated the leaders of the commons to put forth their celebrated Remonstrance.

This Remonstrance was a recapitulation of all the illegal acts which had taken place since the king's accession, laying the blame, however, not on the king himself, but on evil ministers, who are called in it "*a malignant party*." It was vigorously opposed in the commons. The debate on it, on the 22d of November, lasted from nine o'clock in the morning until past midnight; several members had left the house on account of age or infirmity, and yet it was carried only by a majority of eleven, which Sir Benjamin Rudyard aptly

compared to "the verdict of a starved jury." Hampden's motion for having it printed was rejected, as being contrary to usage. As Hyde, the chief opponent of this measure, declared that he would protest against it, and Palmer and others cried out that they did protest, it was resolved by Pym and his friends to make an example; and Palmer, who was obnoxious to them on account of his courtesy towards Strafford, was selected and committed to the Tower, the more violent members being for his expulsion. After a few days' confinement, however, he was allowed to resume his seat in the house.

The opposition which the Remonstrance experienced had not been looked for by its advocates. At the conclusion of the debate, Oliver Cromwell (who was then, however, of little note) whispered to Lord Falkland, and with an asseveration said, "that if the remonstrance had been rejected, he would have sold all he had the next morning, and never have seen England more; and he knew there were many other honest men of the same resolution." Having now carried their point, the leaders resolved to make the most of their advantage; and, on the 1st of December, the Remonstrance was presented to the king at Hampton Court, and with it a petition, complaining of a "malignant party," to whom they attributed all the evils, such as the Irish rebellion, which had occurred, and praying for their removal, etc. A few days after, contrary to the king's express wish, both were printed and circulated. Charles, who now began to act by good advice, put forth a reply, which left the parliament no advantage over him; and, a few days after, on receiving an address from the court of aldermen, praying him to reside at Whitehall, he returned to the capital.

The intelligence of the strength and the atrocities of the rebels, which daily arrived from Ireland, made the king urgent with the parliament to take up energetically the affairs of that country. A proposal of the Scots to send ten thousand men to Ulster, to be paid by the English, was agreed to, and a bill for impressing an equal number in England passed the commons:

but, as in the preamble it was asserted that the king had no right to press the subject except in case of foreign invasion, the lords demurred to the doctrine, and the attorney-general also craved to be heard on the king's part against it. The commons then ordered their committee "to meet no more about that business;" the levies were stopped; and it was declared, "that the loss of Ireland must be imputed to the lords." The king, with his usual imprudence, acting, Clarendon says, under the secret advice of St. John, came to the house of lords and proposed "that the bill should pass with a *salvo jure*\* both for the king and people." This interference, however, with a pending bill, both houses joined in declaring to be a breach of privilege, as it really was, and the king made an ample apology. His offer to raise ten thousand volunteers for the service of Ireland was at once rejected; and thus the unfortunate Irish Protestants were sacrificed to the struggles of parties in England. Still, we must not unconditionally impute to the parliament mere factious motives: they vehemently, and not without reason, suspected the king of having originally sanctioned the rising of the Irish; and they well knew that, if once he should have an army at his devotion, he would revoke all his concessions, and pour out his vengeance on the heads of those who had wrung them from him. Their apprehensions were farther increased at this time by his displacing Balfour, the lieutenant of the Tower, "which was looked upon as a bridle upon the city," and giving that office to Colonel Lunsford, "upon whom he might rely." On the complaint of the commons, that Lunsford was a man of desperate character, who had heretofore made his escape from prison, and then fled the kingdom, the king made him resign, and gave his office to Sir John Byron: but even he did not please, and was shortly after replaced by Sir John Conyers.

To weaken the king's party in the lords, the former bill for taking away the bishops' votes was again

\* With a reservation of the question of right.

brought in; and when it was objected that a bill could not be introduced a second time in the same session, Pym replied, that "their orders were not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, not to be altered." It was therefore received, and soon after passed and sent up to the lords. At this period, Lord Falkland, who had previously supported the measure, but who now saw through the designs of the popular party, opposed it; and, on Hampden's saying that "he was sorry to see a noble lord had changed his opinion since the time the last bill to this purpose had passed the house," he replied, "that he had been persuaded at that time by that worthy gentleman to believe many things which he had since found to be untrue, and therefore he had changed his opinions in many particulars, as well as to things as to persons."\*

The old tactics of rumours and petitions were also again resorted to. It was at this time that Beale, the tailor, overheard the project for assassinating the lords and commons. A petition likewise was published in the name of "the apprentices, and those whose apprenticeships were lately expired," stating "that they found the beginning of great mischiefs coming upon them, to nip them in the bud when they were first entering into the world, the cause of which they could attribute to no others but the papists and the prelates, and that malignant party that adhered to them, etc." The publication of this petition had its natural result, the resort of multitudes to Westminster, shouting, "No bishops! no bishops!" The train-bands, whom the king had appointed to guard the houses of parliament, having repelled the rabble from the house of peers by threatening to fire on them, the commons sent to the lords, desiring them to be discharged, declaring that it should be lawful for every member to bring his own servant, armed, to attend at the door. The mob, thus encouraged, came in greater numbers about the house of peers, crying, "No bishops! no popish lords!" and calling those who opposed the com-

\* Clarendon, ii., 76.

mons "rotten-hearted lords." When the lords sent to the commons, complaining of the insults which they received, some of the members said, "We must not discourage our friends, this being a time we must make use of all our friends;" and Pym exclaimed, "God forbid the house of commons should proceed in any way to dishearten people to obtain their just desires in such a way." A writ was then issued, by direction of the lords, to the sheriff and justices, requiring them to appoint strong watches, to prevent this conflux of people to Westminster. This the commons voted to be a breach of privilege, and they sent one of the justices who acted on it to the Tower. During the Christmas holydays, the crowds became still greater, and the cry of "No bishops! no popish lords!" still louder. They were even heard to say before Whitehall, "that they would have no more porter's lodge, but would speak with the king when they pleased." Some read aloud the names of "disaffected members of the house of commons," and of "false, rotten-hearted" lords. They threatened to pull down the houses of the bishops, and assaulted several of them in their coaches; they laid hold on the Archbishop of York, and would, it is said, have murdered him if he had not been rescued.

This prelate was the celebrated Williams, whom the king had lately elevated to an archiepiscopal see. The day he was assaulted he sent for the bishops, to the number of twelve or thirteen, who were in town, and proposed, as it was no longer safe for them to go to the house of peers, that they should present a protestation against the restraint thus imposed upon them, and against all the acts that might be done during their compulsory absence from the house. They agreed to take this course, and all signed the protestation, which Williams himself carried to the king, requesting him to transmit it to the peers. This request was complied with; and the lords, on receiving it, asked a conference with the commons, the result of which was the impeachment and committal to the Tower of the prelates, whose conduct, though highly imprudent, was certainly not illegal.

There were many members of the house of commons, who, though zealous for the correction of abuses, disliked the measures of Pym and his party. Such were the upright Lord Falkland, Sir John Colepepper, and Mr. Hyde. The king was advised to call these men to his councils, and offered the place of secretary to the first, which with some difficulty he was induced to accept; while the second was made chancellor of the exchequer. Hyde declined taking any office for the present, saying that he should be able to do better service by continuing as he was. Lord Digby was already greatly in the confidence of the king, to whose cause his levity and indiscretion often proved of serious injury.

On Newyear's day, 1642, a quarrel took place at Westminster, in which some blood was shed. A number of officers of the late army, and several of those soldiers of fortune who were then so numerous, had offered their services to the king as a guard, and the same was done by the students of the inns of court. Their offer was rather imprudently accepted, and various rencounters took place between them and the mobs that resorted to Westminster. It was on this occasion that the terms Roundhead and Cavalier came into use, the former being given in reproach to the close-cropped apprentices and others of the citizens,\* who returned it by naming their opponents Cavaliers, as military hectors were then usually called.

The 3d of January, 1642, was rendered ever memorable by an act of fatal imprudence on the part of the king. Without consulting any of his ministers (except perhaps Digby), he ordered Herbert, the attorney-general, to proceed to the house of peers and exhibit

\* Clarendon, ii., 93. "Their hair," says Warburton, "according to the city fashion, being cropped round and close." Mrs. Hutchinson, however, says (p. 99), "Few of the Puritans, what degree soever they were of, wore their hair long enough to cover their ears, and the ministers and many others cut it close round their heads with so many little peaks as was something ridiculous to behold. From this custom of wearing their hair, that name of Roundhead became the scornful term given to the whole parliament party."

charges of high treason against the Lord Kimbolton, Denzil Hollis, Sir Arthur Haselrig, Pym, Hampden, and Strode. At the same time a sergeant-at-arms appeared at the bar of the commons, and demanded that the five accused members should be surrendered to him. Other servants of the king had already gone to these members' lodgings, and sealed up their trunks and studies. The house sent a message to the king, "that the members should be forthcoming as soon as a legal charge should be preferred against them," and then adjourned.

Next day, when the house met, they sent to inform the lord-mayor and common council that their privileges were like to be broken and the city put into danger, and advised them to look to their security. They then adjourned till one o'clock. When they met again, secret information having been received (from Lady Carlisle, it is said) of what was to happen, the house gave the five members leave to absent themselves, and they accordingly withdrew. Presently the king arrived with all his guard and pensioners, and two or three hundred gentlemen and soldiers, mostly armed. These he ordered to remain in the hall, and, on their lives, not to come into the house. He entered with his nephew, the Palsgraf, took off his hat, and advanced to the speaker's chair, who quitted it at his approach. The king stepped up to it, and, having looked round for a time, told the house he would respect their privileges, but that treason had no privilege, and he was come for those five members. He called Pym and Hollis by name; when no answer being returned, he asked the speaker where they were. Lenthall fell on his knees, and said, "he was a servant to the house, and had neither eyes nor tongue to see or speak anything but what they commanded him." The king replied, that "he thought his own eyes were as good as his;" and then said "his birds were flown, but he did expect the house would send them to him; and if they did not, he would seek them himself, for their treason was foul, and such a one as they would all thank him to discover." He then assured them that the accused

should have a fair trial, and retired, pulling off his hat till he reached the door. On his way out, the words "privilege ! privilege !" uttered by many voices, reached his ears.

What the particular charges proposed to be made against these members were, is uncertain. Some are of opinion that the king intended to produce against them the proofs he had obtained in Scotland of their inviting the Scots, in 1640, to march into England ; but then, since that period an act of oblivion had been passed. Perhaps it was some portion of their late proceedings, for which he now thought himself sufficiently strong to punish them.\* The proceeding was certainly a *coup d'état* for the recovery of his lost power. Clarendon says he was instigated to it by Digby ; and the queen, who had been menaced with an impeachment, certainly urged him on. It has been stated,† that when, on cooler thoughts, he resolved not to put his project of going to the house into execution, she cried to him, "Go, coward ; go, pull these rogues out by the ears, or never see me more ;" and that, when the hour for the deed was past, she said to Lady Carlisle, "Rejoice, for I hope that the king is now master in his states, and that such and such are in custody."

The five members had retired to a house in Colman-street in the city, which was their stronghold. Rumour was set busily at work ; people ran to and fro during the night, crying, "the Cavaliers are coming to fire the city !" others added, that "the king himself was at the head of them." The whole city spent

\* Whitelock says that the principal charges preferred against them by the king were in substance these : endeavouring to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and to take from the king his rightful authority ; alienating the people from their sovereign by malicious misrepresentations of his acts and intentions ; inviting a hostile force (alluding to the Scots) to invade the kingdom ; and encouraging and raising tumults among the people, the better to effect their designs.—*Am. Ed.*

† *Mémoires de Madame de Motteville*, i., 265. Milton (*Eikonoclast.*, ch. iii.) alludes to the influence of the queen in this unhappy affair.



the night under arms ; and the next morning, the king, having sent to the lord-mayor to call a common council, came at ten o'clock to the Guildhall, attended only by three or four lords. He here addressed the people, expressing his sorrow that they should have apprehended danger from him : adding, that, to show his confidence in them, he was come without a guard, and that he was sure they would not shelter those whom he intended to proceed against legally for high treason. He then told one of the sheriffs that he would dine with him. As he went through the city, shouts of " Privilege of parliament !" were raised, and one person flung into his coach a pamphlet, entitled, " To thy tents, oh Israel !" the words with which the ten tribes abandoned Rehoboam, the son of Solomon.\*

While the king was in the city the commons met ; and, having declared his late conduct to be the highest breach of privilege, and themselves not to be safe, adjourned for a few days, appointing a committee to sit at Merchant-tailors' Hall, " and all who came to have voices." The lords also adjourned.

The next day, the 6th, the king issued a proclamation for the apprehension of the five members ; and the committee met in the city, where another committee of the common council also sat, in order to communicate with them. Their chief occupation was, for the present, to collect all the particulars of the late breach of their privileges. The five members were afterward brought to the committee in great state ; and a declaration was drawn up, in which the conduct of the king respecting them was affirmed to be a high breach of privilege, and his proclamation " false, scandalous, and illegal." It farther contained a narrative of the transactions on the 4th, full of gross exaggeration, if not palpable falsehood ; and this mere declaration of the committee was printed and circulated, a thing without precedent.

A petition from the city was at this time presented

\* It was, says Lilly, " a new sermon, whereof the text was, *To thy tents,*" &c.

to the king on the subjects of the Irish rebellion, the papists, the changes at the Tower, the "late invasion of the house of commons," etc. Tumultuous crowds repaired to Westminster; "and it was a dismal thing," says Whitelock, "to all sober men, especially members of parliament, to see and hear them." Finally, intelligence came of the great preparations in the city to bring the accused members in triumph to the parliament on the 11th, the day to which the houses stood adjourned. The king, deeply mortified at his own imprudence, and anxious to escape the insults and the danger which he apprehended, took the farther unwise resolution (as many thought it) of quitting Whitehall, and on the 10th he retired with his queen and children to Hampton Court.

The next day, in the afternoon, the river was covered with boats; and between two lines of lighters and long-boats carrying ordnance and prepared for action, the five members, attended by the sheriffs and a part of the train-bands, proceeded to Westminster. Another body of these latter advanced along the Strand. Their commander was one Skippon, who, having risen from the ranks in the Dutch service, had been made captain of the artillery-ground to drill the citizens, and he now bore the novel title of "sergeant-major-general of the militia of the city of London." They were followed by vast numbers of the people, shouting against bishops and popish lords, and for privilege of parliament, and asking contemptuously as they passed Whitehall, "What is become of the king and his Cavaliers?"

The members took their seats. Pym rose and expatiated on the great kindness and affection which they had experienced in the city; the sheriffs then were called in, and thanked by the speaker; the masters and officers of ships were also thanked; and Skippon was appointed to attend each day with such a guard as he thought proper for the two houses. Next came four thousand men of Bucks, all on horseback, with the Protestation in their hats, a proffer of their services to the parliament, and a petition to the

king, complaining of the accusation of the knight of their shire, Mr. Hampden.\*

"From this day," says Clarendon, "we may reasonably date the levying of war in England, whatsoever hath been since done being but the superstructures upon those foundations which were then laid." Both parties had, in fact, resolved on an appeal to the sword: but, to do them justice, neither had any anticipation of the protracted contest, and of the bloodshed and calamities that were to ensue: each thought that the mere display of force would suffice to intimidate the other. Of the king's intentions we think there can be no doubt; and the late attempt on them had convinced the popular leaders that their only safety lay in depriving the sovereign of his power.†

The officers and others, who had formed a kind of guard for the king, followed him out of town. They lodged at Kingston-on-Thames that night; and the next day, the 12th, Lord Digby came thither in his coach-and-six from Hampton Court, with a message from the king accepting the proffer of their services. The design in this is manifest: but how the commons could, with any sense of truth or justice, designate the conduct of Digby a levying of war against the king and kingdom, is somewhat strange. Digby, conscious of his own designs, and aware of their vengeance, fled to Holland. On the king's refusal to remove Byron from the command of the Tower, the houses directed Skippon to place a guard around it, that neither provisions might go in nor ammunition come out; they directed Sir John Hotham to proceed to Hull, where the arms and ammunition of the late army had been laid up, and to protect them with the aid of the train-bands of the adjoining parts; and they sent also orders to Goring, governor of Portsmouth, to let no one in or out of that town but by their or-

\* "Whereof," says Whitelock, "probably he was not altogether ignorant beforehand."

† "Mr. Hampden," says Clarendon, "was much altered after this accusation, his nature and courage seeming much fiercer than before."

ders. We must here again observe, that the secret designs of the king, with all of which Pym and his friends were made acquainted by Lady Carlisle and others, offered some justification of these stretches of power by the parliament. They knew, for example, that he had sent the Earl of Newcastle, a man who was zealously devoted to him, to Hull, near which his estates and influence lay, with "a private commission to be governor thereof," says Clarendon, "as soon as it should be fit to publish such a command, and, in the mean time, by his own interest to draw in such of the country as were necessary to guard the magazine."

The grand object of the parliament was to obtain the entire control over the military force of the kingdom. For this end, a bill which had been drawn up by St. John the last summer for settling the militia, was now brought in and read, with the important addition of "the putting all the forts, castles, and garrisons into the hands of such persons as they could *confide in*." Clarendon on this remarks, that "when it had been with much ado accepted and first read, there were few men who imagined it would ever receive farther countenance; but now there were very few who did not believe it to be a very necessary provision for the peace and safety of the kingdom. So great an impression had the late proceedings made upon them, so that with little opposition it passed the commons, and was sent up to the lords."

As the peers, however, hesitated to pass a measure so adverse to the crown, every effort was made to intimidate them. Thus, when, on one occasion, the popular party in the lords had recourse to their usual tactics of crying "Adjourn! adjourn!" when they found matters likely to go against them, the Duke of Richmond, a courtier, said, "If they would adjourn, he wished it might be for six months." For this the commons voted to "accuse him to the lords to be one of the malignant party," and to desire them to join in a petition to the king to remove him from any office about his person. Petitions also came pouring

in from the counties around London, praying for all that the commons wanted. The common council of the city, when applied to for a loan to carry on the war in Ireland, could see no security for trade, or anything else, unless the lieutenant of the Tower were removed, and it and the other fortresses "put into such hands in whom the parliament might confide." Soon after came "The humble petition of many thousands of poor people in and about the city of London." These suiters could see no means of averting the ruin about to engulf them but the removal of "the bishops, and the popish lords, and others of that malignant faction;" which, if not done, "they shall be forced to lay hold on the next remedy which is at hand to effect it; want and necessity breaking the bounds of modesty." They prayed also that "those noble worthies of the house of peers who concur with you in your happy votes, may be earnestly desired to join with this honourable house, and to sit and vote as one entire body." Most gracious words were given to these amenders of the state; and Hollis, acting on the last hint, when he was sent to request the lords to join in a petition to the king about the militia, desired that "those lords who were willing to concur would find some means to make themselves known, that it might be known who were against them, and they might make it known to those that sent them." The porters of London came, to the number of fifteen thousand, with a petition to the commons, complaining of the "prevalence of that adverse, malignant, blood-sucking, rebellious party," the cause of all the evils. Trade, they said, was dead for want of fortification of the Cinque ports,\* whence they themselves "did want employment in such a measure as did make their lives very uncomfortable." In conclusion, they desired "that justice might be

\* Certain ports on the southern coast of England, which were usually guarded with special care, from their being opposite to the coast of France, and therefore more particularly exposed to attack from that quarter. They were Dover, Rye, Hastings, Sandwich, Hith, Rummey, and Winchelsea.—*Am. Ed.*

done upon offenders according as the atrocity of their crimes had deserved; for, if those things were any longer suspended, they should be forced to extremities not fit to be named, and to make good that saying, that necessity hath no law." The zeal of the good dames of the city was no less fervid: headed by Mrs. Anne Stagge, "a gentlewoman and brewer's wife," thousands of them came with a petition to the commons, against prelates, papists, and so forth. The petition having been read, Pym was sent out to answer them. He thanked them for their supplication, which "came in a seasonable time," assured them their desires should be attended to, and entreated them "to repair to their houses, and turn their petition into prayers at home" for the commons.

Under the influence of this external pressure, the lords passed the bills for impressment and for taking away the bishops' votes: to both which the king was induced, chiefly by the queen, to give his assent. To the ordinance in which the two houses joined respecting the militia, he deferred giving an answer till he should be at Dover, whither he was about to attend the queen, who, under the pretext of conveying his baby-wife to the Prince of Orange, was going to Holland, taking with her the crown jewels, in order to purchase arms and ammunition for the impending contest. Charles feared that, if he were to give a positive refusal at the time, the queen's departure might be prevented.

The queen being safely off, Charles came to Greenwich, whither the Prince of Wales was brought to meet him. He then gave his answer respecting the militia, offering to appoint the lords-lieutenant of counties nominated by parliament, provided that the powers to be given them should first by law be vested in himself. The houses voted the advisers of this reply enemies to the state. The king then went to Theobald's, whither he was followed by a committee with a petition, stating that, if he did not assent to what they had proposed, they would be obliged, for the safety of himself and his kingdom, to dispose of

the militia themselves in the manner propounded to him. They also prayed that he and the prince would continue to reside in or about London. Charles gave an instant reply, declining to assent to their demands, but assuring them, on his honour, "that he had no thought but of peace and justice to his people." The parliament, on receiving this answer, resolved that the kingdom should be put in a posture of defence, and that a declaration "containing the causes of their just fears and jealousies" should be sent to the king. This declaration found him at Newmarket: his answer to it was of the same tenour with his former one. When the Earl of Pembroke asked him "whether the militia might not be granted as was desired by the parliament for a time?" he replied, with an oath, "Not for an hour. You have asked that of me in this was never asked of a king, and with which I will not trust my wife and children." The committee returned to London, and the king pursued his journey to York, where he arrived the latter end of March.

As we are now on the eve of the civil war, we will state the previous conduct of both parties. The king had assented to all that was demanded of him, except parting with the militia, and even in this he had yielded in a great measure. At the same time, he had given abundant proof that he only waited a favourable opportunity, by stratagem or force, to regain all that he had surrendered; and that the parliament had no security but in his weakness: but that he had no power now to make a successful attempt, unless he should be aided by the indiscreet conduct of his opponents, late events had fully shown. Despotism was what he aimed at, that is plain: but did the popular leaders aim at nothing beyond the maintenance of constitutional liberty? This will best appear from an examination of their acts in the year preceding.

"After every allowance has been made," says Hallam,\* "he must bring very heated passions to the rec-

\* Constitutional History, ii., 192.

ords of those times, who does not perceive in the conduct of the house of commons a series of glaring violations, not only of positive and constitutional, but of those higher principles which are paramount to all immediate policy." He then refers to the following instances: the ordinance for disarming recusants, and that authorizing the Earl of Leicester to raise men for the defence of Ireland—encroachments on the prerogative; Pym's menace to the peers, that if they did not pass the bills sent to them by the commons, these last, "with such of the lords as are more sensible of the safety of the kingdom," would represent the same to the king,\* and their accusation of the Duke of Richmond, above noticed—encroachments on the house of peers; their enormous extension of privilege, any one saying a word in opposition to their measures being sent away to prison,† as were also those charged with introducing ceremonies into the church (a thing surely not belonging to them), and "the outrageous attempts to intimidate the minority of their own body, by committing them to the Tower for such language used in debate as would not have excited any observation in ordinary times."‡ Then,

\* This resolution, the germe of that of the house of lords being useless, was moved by Pym Dec. 3, 1641, "before the argument, from necessity, could be pretended." On Mr. Godolphin's objecting that, if *they* went to the king with the lesser part of the lords, the greater part of these might go to him with the lesser part of them, he was ordered to withdraw, and his offence was to be taken into consideration the following Tuesday.—Hallam.

† One Sandford, a royalist tailor, being charged with saying "that the Earl of Essex was a traitor; that all the parliament were traitors; that the Earl of Warwick was a traitor, and he wished his heart in his boots; and that he cursed the parliament, and wished Mr. Pym (calling him King Pym) and Sir John Hotham both hanged;" for this the lords (the puppets of the commons) sentenced him to be kept at work in Bridewell *for his life*, besides some minor inflictions. Pym was called by the royalists King Pym, on account of his portly person and his absolute power over his party.

‡ See the case of Mr. Palmer (above, p. 271). In the debate on the late declaration, in which they most falsely charged the king with a design to change his religion, Sir Ralph Hopton, for saying "that they seemed to ground an opinion of the king's



again, as the same writer observes, "their despotic violation of the rights of the people, in imprisoning those who presented or prepared respectful petitions in behalf of the established constitution, while they encouraged those of a tumultuous multitude at their bar in favour of innovation; and their usurpation at once of the judicial and legislative powers in all that related to the church, particularly by their committee for scandalous ministers, under which denomination, adding reproach to injury, they subjected all who did not reach the Puritan standard of perfection to contumely and vexation, and ultimately to expulsion from their lawful property." He next notices the impeachment of the twelve bishops, whose protest, though "not, perhaps, entirely well expressed; is abundantly justifiable in its argument by the plainest principles of law." In fine, he says that "these great abuses of power, becoming daily more frequent as they became less excusable, would make a sober man hesitate to support them in a civil war, wherein their success must not only consummate the destruction of the crown, the church, and the peerage, but expose all who had dissented from their proceedings, as it ultimately happened, to an oppression less severe, perhaps, but far more sweeping, than that which had rendered the Star Chamber odious."

The farther reflections of this judicious writer, almost the only one who evinces impartiality on this subject, and does not act the part of advocate to one side or the other, are most deserving of consideration. He thinks, as we do, that the parliament, relying on the justice of their cause and the favour of the people, should have accepted the offer of the king respecting the militia.

To understand the question of the militia, it is necessary to recollect, that at this time there was no standing army in England. After the feudal army

apostacy upon a less evidence than would serve to hang a fellow for stealing a horse," was committed to the Tower.—Clarendon, ii., 282. See also the case of Trelawny, stated by him in the following page

had gone out of use, the kings used to raise troops for their foreign wars by contracts with influential noblemen, and by giving very large pay. At the same time the old Saxon *Fyrd* continued under another form, and the men in each shire were required to keep arms, and be ready to suppress insurrection and repel invasion. It was expressly provided by a statute of Edward I. that the militia should not be required to leave their own county except in these cases: but, during the period of the Tudor despotism, this was little heeded; and a statute of Philip and Mary empowered the crown to levy men for service in war, and men were in consequence frequently pressed to serve in Ireland and elsewhere. When it was necessary to call out the forces of the counties, commissions of array were issued to particular persons for this purpose: but the sheriff was the person who usually disposed of the military force of his county. In Mary's reign a new officer, named the lord-lieutenant, was appointed, usually a peer or influential commoner in the county, whose office was altogether military. It was his office to muster and train, when necessary, the able-bodied men of the county; and he was the commander of the militia, or train-bands as they were called. Each county had its magazine of arms and ammunition, to be issued to the train-bands when called into actual service.

As the institution of lords-lieutenant was a Tudor measure, it is quite certain that they had been always named by the crown; yet it was the right of appointing to this office that the commons now demanded; and, sooner than yield to the king on this point, they exposed the nation to a civil war. "No one," says Hallam again, "can pretend that this was not an encroachment on his prerogative. It can only find a justification in the precarious condition, as the commons asserted it to be, of those liberties they had so recently obtained, in their just persuasion of the king's insincerity, and in the demonstrations he had already made of an intention to win back his authority at the sword's point. But it is equitable, on the other hand,

to observe, that the commons had by no means greater reason to distrust the faith of Charles than he had to anticipate fresh assaults from them on the power he had inherited, on the form of religion which alone he thought lawful, on the counsellors who had served him most faithfully, and on the nearest of his domestic ties. If the right of self-defence could be urged by parliament for this demand of the militia, must we not admit that a similar plea was equally valid for the king's refusal? However arbitrary and violent the previous government of Charles may have been, however disputable his sincerity at present, it is vain to deny that he had made the most valuable concessions, and such as had cost him very dear. It was not unreasonable for the king to pause at the critical moment which was to make all future denial nugatory, and inquire whether the prevailing majority designed to leave him what they had not taken away."\*

\* That the conduct of the popular party at this eventful period is liable to severe animadversion for particular acts of violence and oppression, cannot be denied; nor was it to be expected, under circumstances so grave and exciting, that any set of men possessing the common frailties of human nature should be free from error. That there were also among the popular leaders ambitious and unprincipled men, mere brawlers for liberty to promote their own sinister ends, admits of as little doubt; for such ever has been, and probably ever will be, the case. But, having made these concessions, due as well to the cause of freedom itself as to truth, the friends of liberty and of human rights can never cease to look upon this great struggle against despotism with admiration and delight; and the name of Hampden will ever appear among the foremost of the distinguished asserters of those glorious principles, to the admission and practical application of which we are alone indebted for exemption from tyranny, and the blessings of free government. It is allowed on all hands, that the concessions made by the king were wrung from him only by the unconquerable firmness of the commons, entirely against his will, and that, therefore, no confidence could be reposed in him; especially as it was an avowed principle with him that he was under no obligation to keep faith with his subjects in relation to his prerogatives, and might at any time reclaim what he had once given up. With such an antagonist to contend against, wholly insincere and faithless, watchful for an opportunity to recover his despotic authority, and with powerful means still at his command, it is surely nothing wonderful that the commons should have availed them-

## CHAPTER VII.

## CHARLES I. (CONTINUED).

1642-1644.

Gates of Hull shut against Charles.—Manifestoes on both sides.—Raising of Money and Troops.—Royal Standard raised at Nottingham.—Battle of Edgehill.—Affair at Brentford.—Treaty at Oxford.—Arrival of the Queen.—Waller's Plot.—Battles of Lansdown and Roundway-down.—Death and Character of Hampden.—Surrender of Bristol.—Siege of Gloucester.—Battle of Newbury.—Ill conduct of the King.—Cessation with the Irish Rebels.—Death and Character of Pym.—Oxford Parliament.—Progress of the War.—Battle of Cropredy Bridge.—Battle of Marston Moor.

THE nobility and gentry of York and the adjoining counties now resorted to the king with ardent expressions of sympathy and attachment. He had, in their estimation, placed the parliament in the wrong, and they were indignant at beholding the continued efforts (the secret motives of which they were ignorant of) for stripping the sovereign of all his powers and prerogatives. Many of the peers also now came to him from London; and, in the paper war of declarations, etc., carried on between him and the parliament, his manifestoes, prepared by Hyde, were drawn

selves, to the fullest extent, of every support that could be obtained from the side of the people; for on what but the popular support could they rely to sustain them in the stand which they had taken? Hence they encouraged petitions for the redress of grievances (a thing certainly very right in itself); political sermons favouring their cause (of more questionable propriety); popular movements of various kinds, &c. That all the expedients thus employed were entirely justifiable, will not be pretended; nor was it possible, perhaps, at such a time, that abuses should be entirely avoided. The actors in these scenes were men, and therefore committed, no doubt, many follies and some crimes; but their cause was a noble one, and it may be said, we think, that, on the whole, they nobly sustained it.—*Am. Ed.*

VOL. III.—B 3

up with much ability. His tone now became more elevated; there was an end of concession, and he insisted on his rights; and, in the opinion of many, he required no more than he had a just claim to.

The pernicious influence of the queen, though absent, was still felt. In his devotedness to her, Charles thought himself bound, regardless of consequences, to fulfil any unwary promise which she had drawn from him; and he now, in compliance with her will, and in opposition to the opinion of his best advisers, required the earls of Essex and Holland to resign their staff and key of office. By this he merely gratified spleen, while he lost the substantial advantage of such restraint as honour might have imposed on these noblemen in their subsequent conduct.

The Earl of Northumberland, lord-admiral, being in delicate health, the commons petitioned that the Earl of Warwick should be appointed to command for a year in his stead; but the king, when this request was made known to him, returned for answer that it was his desire that Sir John Pennington should be appointed. The parliament, however, persisted, and Warwick took the command of the fleet without the king's consent. A petition was next presented that the magazine should be removed from Hull to London. This, of course, was refused; for to obtain possession of it was a principal cause of the king's going to the north. On the 8th of April he sent a message to the houses, declaring his intention to proceed in person to suppress the rebellion in Ireland, for which purpose he wished to raise a guard of two thousand foot and two hundred horse in the counties about West Chester, to be armed from the magazine at Hull. The reply of the parliament to this message was a positive refusal of their consent, and orders were sent to Hotham to transport the warlike stores in his keeping to London. The king, who regarded the magazine as his private property, resolved to go forthwith and take possession of it. He therefore, on the 22d, sent the young Duke of York, with some attendants, to Hull, where they were received with all

due respect to Hotham. The next morning he proceeded thither himself, with two or three hundred of his servants and of the gentlemen of the county; and, as he approached the town, he sent word to the governor that he was coming to dine with him. Hotham, an irresolute man, was in great perplexity; but the magistrates and officers persuaded him not to admit the king. Charles consequently found the bridges up, the gates shut, and the defences manned. Hotham appeared on the walls; and on his knees, with many professions of duty, declined admitting him, lest he should offend the parliament. The king, finding all his efforts vain, proclaimed Hotham a traitor, and retired, deeply mortified, to Beverley. The Duke of York and his retinue were allowed to depart in safety. In reply to the complaints of the king, the parliament justified the conduct of Hotham, and the ordnance and ammunition in Hull were shortly afterwards removed to London.

The parliament now issued orders to the lords-lieutenant to put their ordinance\* respecting the militia into execution: the king, on the other hand, forbade obedience to it, and issued commissions of array. While both sides were engaged in raising and disciplining men, the appeal to the people, by means of declarations and manifestoes, was kept up, and messages and replies to them were constantly passing between York and London. On the 2d of June the parliament sent their *ultimatum* in a petition containing nineteen articles, which, as Hallam well observes, "went to abrogate in spirit the whole existing constitution:" for they required that the king should consent to all the changes in church and state which they had proposed; that no office of any kind should be conferred without their approval, *i. e.*, without their appointment; that the laws against recusants should be put in force; and that their children should be taken from them, to be educated by Protestants, etc., etc.

\* An ordinance was a measure which had passed the two houses; but, not having had the royal assent, could not be called an act of parliament, though it was enforced as if it were such.

If he would consent to these demands, they promised to provide for him an abundant revenue. The king returned an indignant reply, "protesting that if he were both vanquished and a prisoner, in worse condition than any the most unfortunate of his predecessors had ever been reduced unto, he would never stoop so low as to grant those demands, and to make himself of a King of England a Duke of Venice."\*

A majority of the peers, and also many members of the lower house, were now with the king at York, and for this nine of the former were impeached by the commons. The lord-keeper Littleton had likewise been induced to send the great seal to the king, and he himself shortly after repaired to York. In the presence of the attendant peers, on the 13th of June, the king made a solemn declaration of his determination to maintain the laws and the Protestant religion; while they, in return, subscribed a pledge to defend the crown and the Protestant religion, the liberties of the people, and the just privileges of the king and parliament. Charles, moreover, on the 15th, made a solemn protestation before them that he had no intention of levying war against the parliament, and they subscribed a declaration of their full belief in his sincerity. Among the subscribers was the upright Falkland: we may therefore be certain that there was no fraud designed.† As the parliament had passed an order for bringing in money or plate for maintaining horsemen and providing arms, the king wrote to the lord-mayor and aldermen of London not to raise any forces for them: at the same time, he invited his subjects to bring him horses, arms, and money on the security of the royal parks and forests, and for which he would pay eight per cent. interest.

Charles went to Nottingham and Lincolnshire, where his addresses and declarations had a good ef-

\* May, 129.

† Brodie (iii., 336) sneers at Lord Falkland for his share in this "melancholy picture of insincerity, nay, downright perfidy." He should have inquired if those who now sat at Westminster were regarded at York as *the* parliament.

fect; and a vessel, sent by the queen with arms and ammunition (of which hitherto he had none), having arrived, he advanced, with three thousand foot and one thousand horse, to lay siege to Hull: but the Earl of Warwick having secured the fleet, on whose co-operation he had relied, and his raw train-bands not standing their ground when the besieged made a sally, he found it expedient to retire. The parliament, on their side, were far advanced in their preparations: they had, on the 4th of July, appointed a "Committee of Safety," consisting of fifteen persons, as an executive; and it was voted that an army of twenty regiments of foot and seventy-five troops of horse should be raised. Funds were easily obtained by means of loans; and, "by the endeavours of sundry ministers and others, a great quantity of money, plate, and ammunition was brought in, even by some poor women to their wedding rings and bodkins."\*

The balance of power seemed greatly on the side of the parliament. They were in possession of all the magazines and forts, except Newcastle-on-Tyne; and the people of London and all the great towns were mostly in their favour, as were those of the southern and eastern counties: but those of the north and west, and of Wales, inclined more to the royal cause. The great body of the nobility and gentry were on the side of the king, and the Catholics were unanimous in his favour. But every county, every town and village, and almost every family, was divided in sentiment: some being, from principle or prejudice, in favour of the ancient order of things, while others were desirous of change, and ardent for revolution.

The parliament gave the command of their army to the Earl of Essex. This nobleman, whom we have seen in his early youth disgraced by the infamy of his countess, had long served in the Low Countries, and

\* Whitelock. "The seamstress brought in her silver thimble, the chambermaid her bodkin, the cook her silver spoon; and some sort of females were free in their contributions so far as to part with their rings and earrings, as if some golden calf were to be set up and idolized."—*Howel, Philanglus*, p. 128.



acquired in that school a knowledge of military discipline and tactics.\* He may have retained a painful recollection of the treatment he had experienced from the father of the king, but he was a man of unblemished honour, and a foe neither to the monarchy nor the church. The Earl of Bedford, also a man of moderate character, was appointed his lieutenant-general. Many soldiers of fortune who had been in the late Scottish army received commissions. Such members of either house as had sufficient influence to raise a regiment of foot or a troop of horse, held the command of them as colonels and captains. As there had, as yet, been no certain uniform in the English army, the leaders gave their own colours to their men. That of the general was "orange tawny;" and scarfs of this hue designated the parliamentary soldiers. We also meet with the green coats of Hampden, the red coats of Hollis, the blue coats of Lord Say, and the purple of Lord Brook. Sir Arthur Haselrig's "lobsters," or cuirassiers, were also famous.† The royal troops were raised in a similar manner:‡ but, as they consisted chiefly of the nobility, gentry, and their dependants, they were in general of a superior order to those of the parliament, who enlisted all sorts that offered.§ The troop raised by Oliver Cromwell form-

\* The favourite name for Essex among the soldiers was Old Robin.

† Clarendon, iv., 120.

‡ The "white-coats" of the Earl of Newcastle distinguished themselves at Marston Moor.

§ "At my first going out into this engagement," said Cromwell, "I saw their men were beaten on every hand. I did indeed. . . . 'Your troops,' said I to Hampden, 'are most of them old, decayed serving-men and tapsters, and such kind of fellows; and,' said I, 'their troops are gentlemen's sons, younger sons, and persons of quality. Do you think that the spirits of such base and mean fellows will be ever able to encounter gentlemen, that have honour, and courage, and resolution in them. . . . ? You must get men of a spirit (and take it not ill what I say, I know you will not), of a spirit that is likely to go on as far as gentlemen will go, or else I am sure you will be beaten still.' He was a wise and worthy person, and he did think that I talked a good notion, but an impracticable one," etc., etc.

ed a noble exception. "Cromwell," says Whitelock, "had a brave regiment of horse of his countrymen, most of them freeholders and freeholders' sons, and who upon matter of conscience engaged in this quarrel and under Cromwell. And thus being well armed within by the satisfaction of their own consciences, and without by good iron arms, they would as one man stand firmly and charge desperately."

In the contest that followed we shall meet with little of scientific warfare; none of the skilful manœuvres to bring on or avoid engagements, employed by a Condé or Turenne; no encampments, but the troops on each side quartered in towns and villages; continual beating up of quarters; battles fought whenever the hostile squadrons came in sight of each other; every strong house a garrison, and incessant besieging of towns, castles, and private dwellings. We shall also discern a spirit of humanity, courtesy, and honour; and an absence of atrocities on most occasions, such as have never been witnessed in any other civil war.\*

As is usual in civil commotions, each party gave specious names to its own side, and opprobrious ones to their adversaries. The royalists called their opponents Rebels and Rogues, and were, in return, styled by the latter Malignants. By the term Honest Men, each party meant its own adherents: the Godly, the Well-affected, were also designations of the friends of the parliament.

\* On the breaking out of the war, Sir William Waller wrote to his "noble friend" Sir Ralph Hopton in the following terms: "My affections to you are so unchangeable, that hostility itself cannot violate my friendship to your person, but I must be true to the cause wherein I serve. . . . The great God, who is the searcher of my heart, knows with what reluctance I go upon this service, and with what perfect hatred I look upon a war without an enemy. But I look upon it as *opus Domini*, and that is enough to silence all passion in me. The God of peace in his good time send us peace, and, in the mean time, fit us to receive it! We are both on the stage, and we must act the parts that are assigned us in this tragedy. Let us do it in a way of honour, and without personal animosities."

The commencement of hostilities was as follows. Goring, the governor of Portsmouth, had been in high favour with the parliament since the affair of the army-plot. He had, however, secretly made his peace with the king, and engaged to hold that town for him : yet, so well did he act his part, that the parliament appointed him lieutenant-general of their horse. Under various pretexts he still remained at Portsmouth ; but at length, on receiving peremptory orders to join the army, he declared that he held his post from the king, and durst not quit it without his leave. Forthwith a part of the army under Sir William Waller appeared before the town, Aug. 2. The king, on receiving intelligence of it, proclaimed Essex and his officers traitors, and called on all his faithful subjects to meet him in arms at Nottingham on the 25th of the month. This proclamation the parliament declared to be a scandalous and libellous paper, and all who advised or abetted it traitors.

On the evening of the 25th of August, a stormy day, the king, who was at Nottingham with a small train of horse, rode out of the castle at their head. The royal standard, which was borne by Sir Edward Verney, was then set up, amid the sound of drums and trumpets ; but the whole scene was a melancholy one, and it was regarded as an ill omen that the standard was blown down during the night. From Nottingham the king moved westward, collecting men and receiving voluntary contributions ; and at Shrewsbury his army amounted to eighteen thousand men. Two disastrous events had in the mean time occurred. Goring had been obliged to surrender Portsmouth ; and the Marquis of Hertford, to whom the command of the western counties was committed, had been driven out of them by the Earl of Bedford. Among the misfortunes attending the king may also be reckoned the arrival of his nephews, the princes Rupert and Maurice, two rude, impetuous, unprincipled soldiers of fortune ; to whom, as the royal blood flowed in their veins, he gave high and independent commands, in preference to those gallant men who were hazarding their fortunes and their lives in his cause.

Essex had been for some time with his forces at Northampton, whence he moved towards Worcester, near which place a body of five hundred horse was fallen on and routed by Prince Rupert. On the 10th of October the king left Shrewsbury, and proceeded by Bridgenorth and Birmingham to Kenilworth; whence, after making a halt of some days, he advanced towards the capital; and on Saturday, the 22d of October, he came to a village named Edgecot, within four miles of Banbury. Essex, who was following him, arrived about the same time at the village of Keinton, within seven or eight miles of Edgecot. It had been the design of the king to halt for a day, and to take Banbury; but, on being apprized of the vicinity of Essex, he resolved to turn back and give him battle; and, early in the morning of Sunday, the 23d, the cavalry of the royal army advanced to occupy the summit of Edgehill, which overlooks the valley named the Vale of the Red Horse, in which Keinton lies, at about two miles' distance.

Essex, who had intended to halt that day, and wait for his artillery and the rest of his forces, seeing that he must give battle, drew out his army in the vale. On the right wing he placed the greater part of his horse, under Sir William Balfour, the late lieutenant of the Tower, and now lieutenant-general to the Earl of Bedford; another body, under Sir James Ramsey, the commissary-general, was on the left; while the foot, led by himself in person, occupied the centre. It was not till after noon that the royal army began to descend the hill, for some of the regiments had to march from a distance of seven or eight miles. The cavalry on the right was commanded by Prince Rupert, that on the left by Wilmot, the commissary-general; the foot were led by the Earl of Lindsey, the general in chief; and the royal standard was borne by Sir Edward Verney. The superiority of numbers was rather on the side of the king. The day was clear and fine; and between two and three o'clock, the battle, the first in which Englishmen had been opposed to each other since the war of the Roses, com-

menced by the discharge of cannon on both sides. The infantry then engaged with great spirit; while Rupert, with the impetuosity which characterized him, charged the horse opposed to him and drove them off the field, pursuing them beyond Keinton: but, instead of returning to support the royal infantry, he fell to plundering the baggage which was in that village. Meanwhile, though Wilmot was also successful on the left, the infantry was hard pressed; and a charge made by Balfour on their flank threw them into utter confusion. The Earl of Lindsey was wounded and made prisoner, and with him his son Lord Willoughby of Eresby; Sir Edward Verney was slain and the standard taken;\* and the king himself and his two sons narrowly escaped being captured. When Rupert at length returned, the troops were so broken and scattered that they could not again be brought into action, and night now came on to terminate the conflict. The royal army retired across the hill, while that of the parliament passed the night on the ground, where the next morning they were joined by Hampden's and other regiments to the number of four thousand men: but, instead of following the king, they fell back to Warwick. The number of the slain was said to be about five thousand, the loss probably being nearly equal on both sides. The brave Earl of Lindsey died of his wounds. On the side of the king, Lord Aubigny, brother of the Duke of Richmond, was killed; and on that of the parliament, Lord St. John, and colonels Essex and Ramsey. Each party claimed the victory; the advantage, however, was clearly with the king, for he obliged Banbury to surrender, and marched unmolested to Oxford, whence detachments of his horse advanced towards the capital.†

The parliament, in some consternation, recalled Essex with his army to their defence; and, at the same time, on the 11th of November, they sent a pe-

\* It was recovered, however, by Capt. Smith, who was knighted for the exploit.

† See Appendix (C).

tition to the king, who was now at Colnbrook, for an accommodation. To this he gave a favourable reply : but Prince Rupert, instead of remaining where he was, or retiring, as had been best, to Reading, advanced to Brentford, where one of Essex's regiments lay. After a stout defence they were overcome ; several were drowned in attempting to swim across the Thames, and many were made prisoners. The next day Essex drew out his whole force, amounting, with the city train-bands, to twenty-four thousand men, on Turnham Green. The king, with greatly inferior numbers, on learning that three thousand men, who had been posted at Kingston, were marching round by London to join the main army, led his troops over the bridge at that town, whence he proceeded to Reading ; and, having garrisoned that place and Wallingford, took up his quarters for the winter in Oxford. Though in the affair of Brentford there was nothing contrary to the acknowledged rules of war, no cessation of arms having been agreed on, the parliament made it an occasion of reproach against the king ; charging him with perfidy and bad faith, and his cause was no doubt rather injured than advanced by it.†

Still the desire of the people was for peace ; they had already had a foretaste of the evils of war in the insolence and violence of the soldiery on both sides, and in the heavy impositions laid on them ; an ordinance of the parliament at this very time requiring every man to give up a twentieth of his property for the public service. A deputation from the city proceeded therefore to Oxford on the 10th of January, 1643, and presented a petition to the king, and shortly after, on the 31st, four lords and eight commoners came there with fourteen propositions from the parliament. These, however, were quite as unreasonable as the nineteen at York.† The king, in return,

\* See the just remarks on it in Defoe's "Memoirs of a Cavalier."

† "The nineteen propositions," says Hume, "showed their inclination to abolish royalty : they only asked, at present, the power of doing it."

made six other proposals, which were nearly as unreasonable. The violent men in the commons were for making no reply: but, the more moderate party prevailing, the Earl of Northumberland, with Sir John Holland, Sir William Armyn, and Whitelock and Pierpoint, came to Oxford on the 20th of March, and remained there in treaty till the 15th of April, when they were recalled by the parliament, on the king's refusal to disband his troops unless they would engage to restore the members of both houses, and adjourn to some place twenty miles from London. As Whitelock observes, it was quite improbable that they would "leave the city of London, their best friends and strength, and put a discontent upon them."

The candid Whitelock notices on this occasion the considerable mental power displayed by the king, whose unhappiness was, he says, "that he had a better opinion of others' judgments than of his own."\* One material point he sates they had nearly brought to a conclusion: but, as it was past midnight, the king deferred giving his answer in writing till morning, and the next day his reply was directly the reverse of what he had promised. Some of those who wished the war to continue, had, in the interim, prevailed on him, it is said, to change his mind. Clarendon's account, however, is less favourable to the king, who, he asserts, had pledged himself to the queen never to make peace but through her mediation. -

That royal lady was now in England. She had landed, on the 16th of February, at Burlington, in Yorkshire, having escaped Batten, the parliamentary

\* Lilly had the same opinion of Charles. "Though," says he, "in most dangerous results and extraordinary serious consultations, and very material either for state or commonwealth, he would himself give most solid advice and sound reasons why such or such a thing should be so or not so conducted, yet was he most easily withdrawn from his own most wholesome and sound advice or resolutions, and with as much facility drawn or inclined to embrace a far more unsafe and nothing so wholesome a counsel. He would argue logically and frame his arguments artificially, yet never almost had the happiness to conclude or drive on a design in his own sense, but was ever baffled by meaner capacities."

admiral. This officer, coming into the road, discharged several rounds of shot at the house in which the queen was lodged,\* and she was obliged to rise from her bed, and seek shelter behind a bank in the open fields. The Earl of Newcastle then came and escorted her to York, where she remained for four months. Pym and his party, on the 23d of May, impeached her for high treason, an act well calculated to answer their purposes.

While the king and parliament were thus engaged in negotiation, there had been no cessation of arms, and the balance of success had been clearly on the royal side. In the west, the Cornishmen, led by Sir Ralph Hopton, Sir Bevil Greenvil, and others, defeated Ruthin, the governor of Plymouth, at Bradock-down, near Liskeard, and then took the town of Saltash, and advanced to Tavistock, where a treaty of peace was concluded between the counties of Devon and Cornwall. In Yorkshire a similar truce was concluded between the two parties; and the same was done in Cheshire. But these pacific measures did not suit the designs of the leaders in parliament. They reprobated such engagements: and, in the plenitude of their power, absolved their partisans from keeping them. A farther mode of strengthening the parliamentary cause was the associating of several adjoining counties under the command of a leader appointed by the commander-in-chief. The first and most important of these associations was that among the eastern counties, under the Earl of Manchester.

On the 15th of April the Earl of Essex sat down before Reading with an army of fifteen thousand men. The governor, Sir Arthur Aston, a Catholic and an able officer, having been wounded, the com-

\* "It was," says Hallam, "not only an insolence which a king less uxorious than Charles could never pardon, but a violation of the primary laws and moral sentiments that preserve human society, to which the queen was acting in obedience. Scarce any proceeding of the Long Parliament seems more odious than this; whether designed by way of intimidation, or to exasperate the king and render the composure of existing differences more impracticable."



mand fell to Colonel Fielding. The king advanced to within a few miles of the town: but he found it advisable to consent to a surrender, if good conditions could be obtained; and, on the 27th, Fielding gave up the town, the garrison of between three and four thousand men being allowed to march out with the honours of war, and to take with them all their arms and ammunition. But he basely consented to abandon the deserters, for which he was tried by a court-martial, and sentenced to be beheaded: the penalty, however, was remitted by the king. Essex remained at Reading, though urged by Hampden to advance against Oxford; his soldiers suffering severely by disease, and many of them deserting.

In the latter part of May, the parliament received information of a plot against their authority in the city of London. The principal person engaged in it was Edmund Waller, the celebrated poet: a man of good family and fortune, a member of the house of commons, and one of the late commissioners to Oxford. The object of it seems to have been to put in execution a commission of array\* given by the king for the city, and thus to give strength and union to the friends of peace and the royalists, and force the parliament to come to terms. Many members of both houses, it is said, were acquainted with it; but a servant, overhearing some conversation between certain persons who were privy to it, gave information to Pym; when Waller and some others were arrested, tried, and found guilty of treason by a court-martial. Two eminent citizens, namely, Tomkins (Waller's brother-in-law) and Chaloner, were hanged near their own houses. Waller acted like Lucan in a similar case: accused his most intimate friends, and revealed all their designs; affecting, at the same time, the greatest remorse for his crime, and seeking religious consolation from the leading divines. After a year's confinement he was permitted to retire to

\* A commission to equip and train soldiers for the royal service.—*Am. Ed.*

the Continent, having been first compelled to pay a fine of £10,000. A plot somewhat similar had been discovered at Bristol a short time before, and Robert Yeomans (a late sheriff) and George Bouchier were hanged for their share in it. No men, indeed, were less disposed to endure opposition to their sovereign power than the leaders of the popular party. Waller's plot was made the pretext for imposing a new oath and covenant, never to lay down their arms "so long as the papists in open war against the parliament should be protected from the justice thereof." An ordinance was at the same time passed, that every man should take upon himself this engagement in his parish church.

To return to military affairs. The Cornishmen having defeated their opponents at Stratton on the 16th of May, the Marquis of Hertford and Prince Maurice were sent thither by the king to follow up the success. Devon was speedily reduced, and the royalists advanced into Somerset. The parliament now sent their active general Waller to the west, and an indecisive engagement took place at Lansdown, near Bath, on the 5th of July, in which the gallant Sir Bevil Greenvil was slain. The king sent Wilmot with a body of fifteen hundred horse to the support of the Cornishmen, who were now closely besieged in the town of Devizes. Waller advanced with his troops to prevent this movement; and, the hostile forces encountering on Roundway-down, near Devizes, on the 13th, the parliamentarians were routed with great slaughter. Waller fled to Bristol, whence he hastened to London to justify himself. The parliament, in imitation of Rome, went forth to meet him; and the speaker returned him thanks for his services. Essex and he threw the blame on each other; but Waller never recovered the ground he had lost.

The very day of the defeat of Waller, the queen joined the king at Edgehill with a large re-enforcement of troops, ammunition, and artillery. The royal cause was now, on the whole, prosperous in the north:

for, although Sir Thomas Fairfax had defeated the king's troops at Wakefield on the 20th of May (where Colonel Goring, who had returned, was made prisoner, and a plan of the Hothams to give up Hull to the king was discovered, and they, in consequence of it, sent to London), the defeat of Fairfax by Newcastle at Atherton Moor, on the 30th of June, had been a serious injury to the cause of the parliament.

After a long stay at Reading, Essex advanced to Thame, within ten miles of Oxford. Here Colonel Hurry, one of those Scottish soldiers of fortune who had joined the parliament, not being thought so much of as in his own opinion he merited, went over to the king. As he knew exactly how Essex's army was disposed, he proposed to Prince Rupert to beat up their quarters. The prince assented; and, leaving Oxford in the evening of the 18th of June, they advanced to Wycombe, where a regiment of horse and one of foot were posted; and, falling on them in the night, they either killed or captured the whole detachment. They then proceeded to another village called Chinner, where they had similar success. They now prepared to return to Oxford with their prisoners and booty: but the alarm had been given; and, as they were about to enter a lane leading from the plain of Chalgrave Field, they were overtaken by a body of horse suddenly collected. They turned, and, after a sharp encounter, drove them off, with the loss of Colonel Gunter and some of their other officers, and then proceeded, without farther interruption, to Oxford, where Hurry was knighted by the king.\*

\* Butler's hero distinguished himself in this affair. "That great-spirited little Sir Samuel Luke so guarded himself with his short sword that he escaped without hurt—though twice taken prisoner, yet rescued, and those to whom he was a prisoner, slain. The third time he was taken prisoner, one of his own men, seeing two lead away his master afoot, with his carbine he killed one of them and run the other through with his sword, and mounted Sir Samuel upon one of their horses and brought him clear off, for which his noble master gave him 100*l.*, as he well deserved it."—*Diurnal* quoted by Forster in his *Life of Hampden*, p. 371.

One of the prisoners taken on this occasion said that "he was confident Mr. Hampden was hurt, for he saw him ride off the field before the action was done, which he never used to do, with his head hanging down, and resting his hands on the neck of his horse." This proved to be the fact: Hampden, who had put himself at the head of a troop of horse, was struck by a brace of balls in the shoulder. He rode to Thame and had his wounds dressed: but they proved mortal, and, after suffering for six days, he expired on the 25th of June. His private virtues and eminent talents are generally acknowledged. He exhibited the greatest courtesy and temper in debate; his manner was modest and diffident, and while he spoke as though he were seeking information, he failed not gradually to infuse his opinions into others. His valour in the field was undoubted, and his moral courage in the council and senate was no less eminent; and, being of the root-and-branch party, he would allow no obstacles to impede his design of abolishing the church and the monarchy. That, however, he was actuated by pure motives, is a point about which we think there can be little dispute. The one party naturally exulted at his death, while the other as naturally considered it a great calamity.\*

Essex now retired with his army, broken and dispirited, to Kingston; and Rupert soon after marched to the west, where, being joined by the Cornishmen, he laid siege to Bristol, of which Nathaniel Fiennes, son of Lord Say, was governor, with a garrison of two thousand five hundred foot and two regiments of horse. As the fortifications were weak, on the 25th

\* The most violent enemies of freedom have scarcely dared question the purity of this truly great man. Sir Philip Warwick asserts that even the king lamented his death, having had the greatest confidence in his integrity, and trusting in his mediation more than in anything else to bring about a reconciliation with his people. It is believed that, had he lived, he would soon have been placed at the head of the popular cause, and that, by the influence of his character and his prudent conduct, he would have prevented many of the evils which followed.—*Am. Ed.*

of July Rupert resolved to attempt a storm. The garrison made a gallant defence: but the assailants, though with great loss, possessed themselves of the suburbs; and, while they hesitated what to do farther, the city beat a parley. A surrender was agreed on, the garrison to be allowed to march out with their arms and baggage, and the inhabitants to be protected in their persons and property. These conditions were, however, badly observed: both soldiers and people being plundered by the victors, in retaliation, as Clarendon pretends, for a similar breach of treaty at Reading. "I wish," he adds, "I could excuse those swervings from justice and right which were too frequently practised against contracts, under the notion that they with whom they were made were rebels, and could not be too ill used."\* The king himself soon after joined the army, and Prince Maurice was sent into Devon, where he reduced most of the towns.

"The parliament," says May, their historian, "was now in a low ebb; they had no forces at all to keep the field, their main armies being quite ruined, and no hope in appearance left but to preserve a while those forts and towns which they then possessed; nor could they long hope to preserve them, unless the fortune of the field should change." Under these circumstances they resolved to invite the Scots to their aid; and, on the 20th of July, the Earl of Rutland, Sir Henry Vane, and three others, attended by the divines Marshall and Nye, set out for Edinburgh as commissioners. Measures were at the same time adopted to raise men to recruit Essex's army; and as the city of London lay entirely open and exposed, an intrenchment of twelve miles in circuit was commenced and speedily completed, "gentlemen of the best quality," says Whitelock, "knights and ladies, resorting to the

\* Clarendon, iv., 148. Fiennes was brought to a court-martial for the surrender of Bristol. Prynne and Clement Walker, two bitter, unrelenting persecutors, managed the case against him, and he was sentenced to death (December 28). Essex, however, pardoned him, and he was allowed to retire to the Continent.

works daily, carrying spades, mattocks, and other suitable implements ; so that it became a pleasant spectacle at London to see them going out in such order and numbers, with drums beating before them ; which put life into the drooping people, being taken for a happy omen that, in so low a condition, they yet seemed not to despair." The peace-party, however, was now strong in the houses ; and on Saturday, the 5th of August, a proposal of the lords to enter into negotiations with the king was carried in the commons. But the next day the pulpits were all set at work, and Pennington, the lord-mayor, held a court of common-council, where a petition against the measure was prepared. On Monday, such a multitude came down with this petition, that the lords voted it to be a breach of privilege, and adjourned ; and the commons, under the influence of this pressure from without, rejected the proposition by a small majority.

Had the king marched to London with all his forces, it is possible that the war might have been ended and yet no despotism established : but his advisers feared the spirit of the city militia, and it was resolved to lay siege to Gloucester, the only place of importance between Bristol and Lancashire held by the parliament. Its governor, Colonel Massey, a soldier of fortune, had intimated (so says Clarendon), that if the king should come in person he would not hold out against him ; and accordingly, on the 10th of August, the royal standard was planted "on a fair hill in the clear view of the city," and Charles sent in a message, offering pardon to all without exception. He allowed them two hours to deliberate on their answer ; and "within less than that time," says the historian, "together with the trumpeter, returned two citizens from the town, with lean, pale, sharp, and bad visages, and in such garb and carriage that at once made the most severe countenances merry and the most cheerful hearts sad [serious]. The men, without any circumstances of duty or good manners, in a pert, shrill, undimayed accent, said they had brought an answer from the godly city of Gloucester to the king."

The purport of this answer was, that they held their city for the king, and that they would obey his commands, only as they were signified by both houses of parliament. Massey's defence was brave and skilful, but he was at last reduced to great extremity; and the parliament, learning his condition, sent Essex, with a well-appointed army of fourteen thousand men, to his relief. Essex conducted his march with great prudence, repelling all the assaults of the royal cavalry. At his approach the besieging army withdrew, and he entered the town on the 8th of September, remaining there for two days.

The royalists being superior in cavalry, Essex wished to avoid an action on his return. He halted for five days at Tewkesbury, seemingly intending to proceed northward: but in the night he made a forced march to Cirencester, where he surprised a convoy; and, being thus clear of the open country, he moved leisurely towards London. His army was nearly past Auburn Chase, on its way to Newbury, when its rear was suddenly assailed by Prince Rupert, at the head of five or six thousand horse. Both sides fought gallantly, but this check obliged Essex to halt for the night at Hungerford; and when he thought to enter Newbury the next day, he found that the king had arrived there two hours before him.

An action was now unavoidable. Essex halted for the night, and at six o'clock the following morning (September 20), both armies engaged, and the conflict was kept up till it was terminated by night. The steadiness and intrepidity of the London train-bands excited the admiration of both friends and foes. According to the parliamentary writers, the king lost two thousand men, while on their own side there fell no more than five hundred; but this statement would seem hardly credible. The earls of Sunderland and Carnarvon were slain; but the heaviest loss to the royal party was in the fall of Lord Falkland. This nobleman, in whose praises all unite, had been as earnest for the reformation of public abuses as any man: but when, at last, he began to discover the ulterior

views of the leading reformers, he resolved to throw his influence on the side of the crown, now the weaker party. He had expected that a single decided victory gained by the royal forces would bring the opposite party to reason: but, finding his hopes baffled, he lost all his cheerfulness, and often, after sitting long silent among his friends, he would utter *Peace, peace*, in a sad tone, and declare that the thoughts of the war "took his sleep from him, and would shortly break his heart." On the morning of the battle he called for a clean shirt, saying that if he was slain they should not find his body in foul linen, for he had a strong persuasion that he should not outlive the day. He placed himself in the front rank of Lord Byron's cavalry, and was shot in the lower part of the body, dying shortly after of the wound, at the age of only thirty-four years.

The day after the battle, Essex, after burying the dead, as the royal army did not appear, directed his march to Reading. Rupert followed with his cavalry, and caused some confusion in his rear. Having halted a couple of days at Reading, Essex pursued his march to London, where he was received with the greatest honour. The king garrisoned Reading again, and placed a strong detachment in Donnington Castle, near Newbury, once the residence of Geoffrey Chaucer. He then retired to Oxford for the winter.

During the siege of Gloucester, two occurrences took place, the one strikingly exhibiting the king's folly, and the other his obstinate adherence to despotism.

In the course of the summer, several additional members of both houses had repaired to Oxford. There were still others who had hitherto gone all lengths with the violent party, but who had no mind to destroy the existing constitution. Of these, the chief were the earls of Northumberland, Holland, Bedford, and Clare. Essex himself also agreed with them in sentiment, but his high sense of honour made him decline complying with Holland's proposal of employing the army to compel the two parties to submit to rea-



sonable terms of peace. Northumberland retired to his house at Petworth in Sussex; Holland opened a correspondence through Jermyn with the queen; and soon after, on the 20th of August, with Bedford and Clare, he came to the king's quarters: Clare, who was the least obnoxious, proceeding at once to Oxford, while the other two stopped at Wallingford.

Wisdom, and even common sense, would have taught the king and his advisers to receive these lords with all favour and courtesy. But it turned out quite the contrary. Charles, who was at Gloucester, sent word to his council to deliberate on their reception; and Hyde and Saville, taking a rational view of things, thought they should be graciously welcomed, as an encouragement to others to follow their example: the more violent, however, insisted that they should first be obliged to express on oath their abhorrence of the rebellious arms and counsels; while a third party were in favour of simply treating them with indifference. The king came to Oxford in relation to this affair, and the latter course was fixed on. Bedford and Holland were therefore permitted to come to court, but they found themselves generally shunned. They followed the king to Gloucester, and fought bravely on his side at Newbury: but all availed not to efface the memory of their previous conduct; and, after a stay of three months, they returned to Westminster, where they met with a cool reception, and were even committed, for a short time, to custody. Thus all hopes were lost of drawing away from the parliament a portion of its supporters. The truth is, there was a party at Oxford as adverse to accommodation as the war-party at Westminster: men who looked for titles, places, pensions, and perhaps confiscations, should the royal cause triumph—a thing at this time by no means unlikely—and who wished to have as few sharers as possible in the spoil.

If the king was unwise in this matter, he was, perhaps, still more so in the other—a cessation of arms with the Irish insurgents.

We have seen above that there were reasons for

suspecting that he had authorized the rising of the Irish Catholics. These men had now settled down into a kind of independent state ; and Kilkenny was their seat of government, where a general assembly was held, and a supreme council appointed to act as an executive. Ambassadors were to be sent to the pope and to the great Catholic princes. The English and Scottish forces had, however, in the mean time, been re-enforced, beaten the insurgents repeatedly in the field, and recovered several towns and forts. Under various pretexts, Charles had detained the Earl of Leicester in England, that the Earl (now marquis) of Ormond, a zealous royalist, might have the authority in Ireland. The parliament, always jealous of the king's proceedings in that country, had sent over two of their members to observe matters there : but Ormond, after a little time, sent them back ; and he removed Parsons, and even committed him, Sir John Temple, and two other officers of state, to prison. The parliament, however, with the tide of war at home rather turning against them, looked upon Ireland as of minor importance, and the Catholics had a fair prospect of becoming completely masters of the island : but they were divided into two parties, differing in origin though agreeing in religion, while those of the English blood had no desire to cast off their allegiance. They knew also the power of England, and clearly foresaw that, if the parliament should conquer the king, a fearful vengeance would be taken for the atrocities that had been committed. The proposals of Ormond, therefore, for a cessation of arms during a twelvemonth, though opposed by many of the Irish, were readily listened to ; and on the 15th of September (just four days before the battle of Newbury), the truce was signed, the Irish agreeing to give the king £30,000, half in money and half in cattle. In the following November, Charles appointed Ormond lord-lieutenant, and directed him to send over the regiments that were serving in Ireland. The intelligence of this truce did great injury to the cause of the king in England, many deserting his party on

account of it. In his defence it might be said, that he only followed the example of the parliament, who had sent to invite the Scots. But there was a wide difference between the Scots and the ferocious bands which Charles was arranging to bring over from Ireland to aid in restoring his despotism.\*

Meanwhile Vane and his associates had negotiated a treaty with the Scots; who, though the king had conceded to them all that they required, agreed to lend their aid, on condition of a "Solemn League and Covenant" being entered into by the parliament and people of England. On the 29th of November the treaty was finally concluded: the Scots engaging to furnish an army of twenty-one thousand men, to be paid by the English parliament. It was also agreed that a "committee of both kingdoms," to which each was to send commissioners, should sit in London for the management of the war and the transaction of all affairs between the two nations.†

One of the measures of the parliament this year had been to form a new Great Seal. When it was proposed to the lords, they refused their assent: but, as usual, they could only interpose some delay. The seal was made, and on the 11th of October commissioners were appointed to hold it, and in one day after not less than five hundred writs were sealed. It bore on one side the arms of England and Ireland, and on the other "the picture of the house of commons, the members sitting:" a clear indication of where the real power of the state was supposed to lie.

On the 8th of December died, at Derby House, which the parliament had assigned him for a resi-

\* Warburton, however (note on Clarendon, vii., 591), considers Charles justifiable in the whole of this affair, "as a politician, and king, and governor of his people."

† In this alliance, the Scots, as usual, would dictate respecting the church, and nothing would satisfy them short of the absolute uniformity of the English church with their own kirk. The article, however, was worded to this effect: that the Church of England should "be reformed according to the word of God, and after the example of the best Reformed churches," by which they, of course, thought nothing but the kirk could be meant.

dence, the celebrated John Pym. His disease was an imposthume in the mesentery. He was buried with great pomp in Westminster Abbey, the body being carried by ten of the principal members of the house of commons, and followed by, the remaining members of both houses, and by the assembly of divines. The parliament voted a sum of £10,000 for the payment of his debts, and settled a pension on his son.

The character of this eminent man has been presented under various lights by the writers of the different parties. It must be allowed that no man was ever better qualified to be a parliamentary leader. To an extensive knowledge of the laws and constitution, he joined a manly and impressive elocution; his delivery was grave and dignified, and his person tall and portly. He was also a statesman: he knew how to select his measures, and was never at a loss for expedients to carry them into effect. Clarendon says that he was "the most popular man that ever lived," and that no man better understood "the temper and affections of the kingdom." He was no fanatic in religion, and he does not appear to have had any particular ill feeling towards the Episcopal Church. What his original views in politics were, it is difficult to ascertain: we find him of late the determined enemy of accommodation with the king (in whom he had evidently lost all confidence), and it is not improbable that he aimed at the establishment of a republic. Like too many politicians, he occasionally had recourse to arts not strictly justifiable for the accomplishment of his objects.

Such was the state of affairs at the close of the year 1643. The next year opened with an attempt on the part of the king to turn to his advantage the magic of the name of parliament. It was the advice of Hyde, that, "since the whole kingdom was misled by the reverence they had to parliaments," he should summon all the members who had left that at Westminster to repair to Oxford. Charles, besides his inherent antipathy to parliaments, feared, that if he

should convene a legislature, they would endeavour to effect a peace, a thing to which he had no mind at present. It was, therefore, with extreme reluctance that he gave his consent to the measure. This assembly met on the 29th of January, 1644; the house of lords being twice as numerous as that at Westminster, and the commons nearly equal to the popular party in the number of its members: but, as many were absent on military commands, the number which actually met were only forty-three peers, and one hundred and eighteen commoners.\* Their first thoughts were of peace; and that very day they all subscribed a letter to Lord Essex, inviting him to co-operate with them in putting a stop to the calamities under which the country was suffering. In reply, Essex sent them the covenant, and two declarations of the parliaments of England and Scotland. As Essex did not communicate the letter to the houses, because, as he said, it did not contain an acknowledgment of them, on the 3d of March the king was induced to send himself a message "to the lords and commons of parliament assembled at Westminster." This, however, they treated as an insult, inasmuch as it put the parliament at Oxford on an equal footing with themselves. The hopes of peace therefore vanished, and the war was renewed.

The expedients adopted by the two parties to raise the necessary supplies were as follows. The popular parliament obtained loans, either voluntary or forced, from the merchants of the city; they required all who had not subscribed of their own accord, to pay the twentieth part of their estates; they sequestered the property of all delinquents within their quarters; they

\* The list published at Oxford made the peers 83, the commons 175; a great many peers, however, had been recently created. Whitelock says that on the 30th of January 280 members appeared in the house of commons at Westminster, and that 100 were absent on the public service; but there must be a mistake, for the number who took the covenant were only 236, and of these 12 afterward went over to the king. Their house of lords did not exceed 30.—See Hallam, ii, 234.

laid a weekly assessment of £10,000 on the city of London, and £24,000 on the rest of the kingdom where their power extended; and, in imitation of the Dutch, they introduced (for the first time) a tax, since so well known under the name of *excise*, on wine, beer, soap, and a variety of foreign and domestic articles, including even butchers' meat. Besides these, they resorted to sundry other expedients for raising money. The king, on his side, procured loans from his adherents; issued private seals; imposed an excise also; exacted a weekly supply from the inhabitants of the country about his garrisons, and sequestered the estates of delinquents within his quarters. The armies, again, of both sides, plundered; but the royal troops, led by such men as Rupert, Maurice, Goring, and Richard Greenvil, committed by far the greatest excesses.\*

The hopes of the king, founded on the truce in Ireland, were disappointed. In the latter part of November, a body of the troops he had proposed to draw to his aid from that country,† landed at Mostyn, in Flintshire, where, being joined to Lord Byron, who commanded at Chester, they obtained sundry advantages over the adherents of the parliament. Early in January they laid siege to the town of Nantwich, which was gallantly defended; and Sir Thomas Fairfax, who was then at Manchester, having joined his forces with those of Sir William Brereton, advanced to its relief. The Anglo-Irish army, though said to be inferior in number, drew out, on the 25th of January, to give battle: but, after an obstinate conflict of two hours, on being assailed by the garrison in their rear, they broke and fled, leaving five hundred slain and fifteen hundred prisoners: among the latter were several of their officers, one of whom was Colonel Monk, afterward so famous.

In the west, the royal forces under Hopton had advanced as far as Arundel. Waller, who had with him about ten thousand men, was at Farnham, whence,

\* See Appendix (D).

† Whitelock expresses himself in some places as if the troops that came over were native Irish, but this is quite incorrect; Mrs Hutchinson (p. 201) is accurate in this point, as usual.

marching by night, he surprised and cut to pieces a royal regiment at Alton, and on the 6th of January reduced Arundel. The king having sent his general, the Earl of Brentford, to re-enforce Hopton, the two armies, about equal in number, on the 29th of March, engaged at Alresford, where the royalists were defeated with the loss of five hundred men, and Waller took and plundered Winchester.

Newark-on-Trent, one of the strongest holds of the royalists, had been for some time besieged by the parliamentary forces. Prince Rupert, who was in Cheshire, having drawn together a good body of horse, prepared to relieve it. He marched with his usual rapidity, and, on the 22d of March, came so unexpectedly upon the besiegers, that, after a brief resistance, they took to flight, leaving their arms, ordnance, and ammunition.

The Scots were now in England. On the 19th of January, the Earl of Leven had crossed the Tweed and advanced to attack the town of Newcastle: but the Earl of Newcastle had thrown himself into the place the day before, and Leven, ordering six regiments to block it up, proceeded southward, followed by the royal army of fourteen thousand men. Leven took his post at Sunderland, where he remained for five weeks. In the mean time, Lord Halifax, being joined by his son Sir Thomas, on the 11th of April attacked at Selby Colonel Bellasis, who commanded the royalists in Yorkshire, and routed him. Newcastle, who was then at Durham, immediately fell back to York, where he was besieged by the Scots and the troops of Fairfax, and to his aid, on the 3d of June, there arrived the troops of the eastern counties (fourteen thousand in number), under Lord Kimbolton, recently made Earl of Manchester, and his lieutenant-general, Oliver Cromwell.

Essex and Waller were both at this time gradually approaching Oxford, with the intention of shutting up the king's forces in that city. But, on the night of the 3d of June, Charles, having sent a body of foot out at the south gate as if for Abingdon, to deceive Wal-

ler, left the town by the north gate with two thousand five hundred foot and all his horse, and proceeded to Worcester, and thence to Bewdley. Waller, thinking that it was his object to effect a junction with Prince Rupert, who was now at Liverpool, threw himself between him and Shrewsbury. Essex, as their plan had been defeated, marched away to the west. The king then made a rapid return to Oxford, and, taking thence his artillery and the rest of his forces, advanced to give battle to Waller. The two armies came in sight near Banbury, the river Charwell dividing them. In the manœuvres to bring on an action, Waller perceiving, on the 29th, the rear of the king's army to be separated from the main body, passed over Cropredy Bridge with a body of his troops to get between them, and, at the same time, sent a party of horse to cross a ford about a mile lower down. He was, however, routed and driven back over the bridge, with some loss, by the Earl of Cleveland, who commanded the king's rear-guard, and his army having gradually dwindled down to four thousand men, he was recalled by the parliament. There was a party among the officers of the royal army, headed by Wilmot, who, for various reasons, were anxious for peace ; and they now renewed a project which they had devised before the king last left Oxford, which was for the royal forces to advance to St. Alban's, and for the king to send thence a gracious message to the two houses and the city. But Charles had the utmost aversion to any measure of the kind, and he determined to follow Essex to the west, where the queen was residing at Exeter, having just given birth to a daughter in that town.

York, in the mean time, was hard pressed : Newcastle had sent to the king to say, that if not relieved he must surrender, and Charles had written to Rupert on the 14th of June, directing him to lay every other project aside, and think only on the relief of York. This active prince made no delay, and on the last day of June he appeared within view of that city, at the head of twenty thousand men. The next day



the allied army drew up to receive him on Hessey Moor, about five miles from the town: Rupert, however, passed the Ouse and entered the city. Newcastle wished him to be contented with having raised the siege, intimating that there were differences between the English and Scottish commanders, which might ripen into discord. But Rupert, besides being so inclined himself, had positive orders from the king to fight.\* Accordingly, the next day (July 2), the royal army went in pursuit of the parliament forces, who were retiring to Tadcaster, and came up with them on Marston Moor. In numbers they were about equal, twenty-five thousand on either side. The right wing of the royalists was commanded by Newcastle, the left by Rupert, and the centre by Goring, Lucas, and Porter: on the other side, Sir Thomas Fairfax commanded on the right, Cromwell on the left, and the centre was under Lord Fairfax and the earls of Manchester and Leven.

At five in the evening both sides stood ready to engage, but the action did not commence till seven.† The prince, with his usual impetuosity, charged the enemy's right wing; and drove them off the field; the royal centre was equally successful, and Leven and his Scots fled to a considerable distance: but Cromwell was victorious on the left; and Sir Thomas Fairfax having rallied his own regiment, he and Cromwell fell on the troops of Rupert and Goring, and night closed on a decisive victory gained by the parliamentarians. The number of slain was said to be upward of four thousand, of whom the far greater part were royalists; fifteen hundred, also, were made prisoners; and all their ordnance, ammunition, and baggage were taken.‡ The next day Rupert retired

\* See the king's letter in Evelyn's *Memoirs*, Appendix 88.

† The following curious fact shows how much less than one might suppose the Civil War interfered with the ordinary pursuits and amusements of the nation. A country squire of that neighbourhood was out with his hounds on the very day of the battle of Marston Moor.—D'Israeli, *v.*, 49.

‡ The queen, in the latter part of June, sent to Essex for a

to the western counties; and Newcastle, in disgust or despair, departed with the lords Widdrington and Falconberg, and retired to the Continent, where he remained for sixteen years. York surrendered; the victorious armies separated, and the Scots moved towards their own country, and closed the campaign by the storming of Newcastle.

The royal cause was now hopeless in the north, but affairs proved more propitious to it in the west. Prince Maurice having retired on the approach of Essex, Weymouth surrendered to him: but, while he was in pursuit of the prince, he received tidings of the defeat of Waller and the approach of the king. His first thought was to give the royal army battle at once; but Lord Roberts, who had large estates in Cornwall, prevailed on him to enter that county, where he assured him of great advantages. Essex therefore crossed the Tamar about the middle of July, and marched by Liskeard and Bodmin to Lostwithiel, followed by the royal army. Charles, thinking this a good time for negotiation, on the 6th of August, wrote with his own hand a letter to Essex, proposing that the two armies should unite, and oblige the enemies of peace to submit to terms. Another letter also came to Essex on the 9th, from the principal officers in the royal army, to the same effect. His reply was, that he had been appointed to fight, not to treat; and that the best advice he could give the king was to go to his parliament. Charles now ordered all his forces to draw closer together, and thus surround Essex's army, and cut off their supplies. By the end of the month, therefore, Essex

safe conduct to go to Bath for her health. He replied, that he could not grant it without the direction of parliament, but that he would not only give her a safe conduct, but accompany her himself to London—where she was impeached! "It is painful," says Godwin, "to see the effect of civil broils as displayed in such instances as this; and we cannot but wonder at this style of reply from a commander so noted for good-breeding and a generous disposition as Essex, in which the brutality of the thought is only exceeded by the ironical language in which it was conveyed."

found his condition desperate : his cavalry, under Sir William Balfour, having, on the 30th, taken advantage of the darkness of the night to pass between two of the divisions of the royal army and thus get off, he himself and some of his principal officers went in a boat to Plymouth, leaving the infantry and some horse under Skippon. This brave officer proposed to them to follow the example of the cavalry, and force their way through the enemy's ranks : but the attempt appeared too hazardous ; and, on the 2d of September, a surrender was proposed and accepted. The arms, ordnance, and ammunition were given up, and the prisoners were conveyed to Poole and Wareham.

Essex proceeded to Portsmouth, where his army was reassembled ; Waller and Manchester were directed to join him there, and the combined army was ordered to give battle to the king on his return from Cornwall. On Sunday, October 27th, they attacked the royal forces at Newbury, the action commencing at three in the afternoon, and lasting till ten at night.\* Essex himself was absent from indisposition. Though the king's forces were inferior in number, the result was dubious, and they marched that night by moonlight in view of the enemy to Wallingford. A few days after, on the 9th of November, the king, having been joined by Rupert, returned for his artillery and ammunition, which he had left at Donnington Castle, and carried them away without opposition. The parliamentarians kept within their lines, and refused battle when offered. This event terminated the campaign.

\* Charles actually ran away during the battle. See Clarendon, iv., 587, and Warburton's note.

## APPENDIX.

---

A, page 188.

### LAUD'S SUPERSTITION.

THE following account of this prelate's mode of consecrating churches is given by Rushworth (ii., 76, 77):

"St. Katherine-Creed church, being lately repaired, was suspended from all divine service, sermons, and sacraments, till it was consecrated. Wherefore Dr. Laud, Lord Bishop of London, on the 16th of January (1631), being the Lord's day, came thither in the morning to consecrate the same. Now, because great exceptions were taken at the formality thereof, we will briefly relate the manner of the consecration.

"At the bishop's approach to the west door of the church, some that were prepared for it cried with a loud voice, *Open, open, ye everlasting doors, that the King of Glory may enter in!* and presently the doors were opened, and the bishop, with some doctors and many other principal men, went in, and immediately falling down upon his knees, with his eyes lifted up and his arms spread abroad, uttered these words: *This place is holy, the ground is holy. In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I pronounce it holy.*

"Then he took up some of the dust, and threw it up into the air several times in his going up towards the chancel. When they approached near to the rail and communion-table, the bishop bowed towards it several times, and returning, they went round the church in procession, saying the 100th Psalm, after that the 19th Psalm, and then said a form of prayer, *Lord Jesus, &c.*, and concluding, *We consecrate this church and separate it unto Thee as holy ground, not to be profaned any more to common use.*

"After this, the bishop being near the communion-table, and taking a written book in his hand, pronounced curses upon those that should afterward profane that holy place by musters of soldiers, or keeping profane law-courts, or carrying burdens through it, and at the end of every curse he bowed towards the east, and said, *Let all the people say Amen.*

"After this followed the sermon, which being ended, the bishop consecrated and administered the sacrament in manner following:

"As he approached the communion-table he made many several lowly bowings, and coming up to the side of the table where the bread and wine were covered, he bowed *seven* times, and then, after the reading of many prayers, he came near the bread, and gently lifted up the corner of the napkin wherein the bread was laid, and when he beheld the bread he laid it down again, flew

back a step or two, bowed *three* several times towards it, then he drew near again, and opened the napkin, and bowed as before.

"Then he laid his hand on the cup, which was full of wine, with a cover upon it, which he let go again, went back and bowed thrice towards it; then he came near again, and, lifting up the cover of the cup, looked into it, and, seeing the wine, he let fall the cover again, retired back, and bowed as before; then he received the sacrament, and gave it to some principal men; after which, many prayers being said, the solemnity of the consecration ended."

### B, page 269.

#### THE IRISH REBELLION.

The first question here is, had the king any knowledge of the meditated rising of the Irish or not? The chief evidence against him is the Information, as it is called, of the Earl of Antrim in 1651, according to which Charles had given a commission to him and Ormond to keep together the army raised by Strafford, to augment it to 20,000 men, and to seize the castle of Dublin and the arms laid up in it for the royal service. This is so very like the king's own conduct in the affair of Hull, that we see little reason to doubt its truth; and it tends to prove that, in the summer of 1641, Charles had taken his resolution to reduce the English parliament by force of arms.

But the Irish Catholics also produced a commission from the king, dated at Edinburgh on the 1st of October, 1641, authorizing them to assemble and meet together, to possess themselves of all the forts, castles, and places of strength, and to *arrest and seize to his use the goods, estates, and persons of all the English Protestants in Ireland*. Of this commission the authenticity has been justly disputed. It is hardly possible that Charles could have directed the seizure of the persons and properties of his Protestant subjects; and there is an assertion contained in it which could hardly be made at that time, namely, that the English parliament had "possessed themselves of the whole strength of the kingdom, in appointing governors, commanders, and officers, in all parts and places therein, at their own will and pleasure." It is also justly observed by Dr. Lingard, that "it was never appealed to by the rebels in any of their remonstrances or apologies." Mr. Brodie argues strenuously in favour of its genuineness: but we still regard it as a forgery, and one of those deceptions to which political parties so frequently have recourse. Charles wished, no doubt, to have an Irish army at his devotion: but he certainly never could have authorized the destruction of the English interest in Ireland.

The next question is, what was the number of the Protestants massacred? The general belief in England was, as we have seen, that it amounted to 200,000. Milton raises it even to 600,000, but he made his calculation in an erroneous manner. Lord Clarendon, who, it should be remembered, must have had

his information from the Duke of Ormond, a man not likely to be misinformed, says, in his *Short View of the State of Ireland* (p. 9), that the Irish papists, "with most barbarous circumstances of cruelty, within the space of less than ten days, murdered an incredible number of Protestants, men, women, and children promiscuously, and without distinction of age or sex." In his *History of the Rebellion* (ii., 19), he says, that "a general insurrection of the Irish spread itself over the whole country, in such an inhuman and barbarous manner, that there were 40,000 or 50,000 of the English Protestants murdered before they suspected themselves to be in any danger, or could provide for their defence by drawing together into towns or strong houses."

Sir William Petty made some calculations in his *Political Arithmetic*, by which he reduced the number to 37,000. P. Walsh, the advocate of the Romanists, made it only 8000. Warner, after examining the depositions, states that the whole number "killed by the rebels *out of war*, not at the beginning only, but in the course of the first two years of the rebellion," amounted to 4028, to which he says may be added about 8000 more killed by ill usage.

Dr. Lingard very strangely treats the accounts in Clarendon, May, and others, as "rhetorical flourishes." "They are not," he says, "founded on authentic documents. They lead the reader to suppose that the rebels had formed a plan to surprise and murder all the Protestant inhabitants; whereas, the fact was, that they sought to recover the lands which, in the last and the present reign, had been taken from them and given to the English planters. They warned the intruders to be gone; they expelled them from the plantations; they seized their goods, and burned their houses. That, in the prosecution of this object, many lives would be lost on both sides, is evident. As early as October 27, Colonel Crawford killed 300 Irish with his cavalry, without the loss of a man; and on the 28th, Colonel Matthews slaughtered above 150 more, 'starting them like hares out of the bushes;' and, on the other hand, many insulated acts of murder by the rebels, prompted chiefly by the revenge of individuals, occurred." He then, in proof of his assertion that no general massacre was intended or made, quotes passages from the despatches of the lords justices during the months of October, November, and December. He farther infers, from a commission issued by them January 18, 1643, that even then they were "ignorant of any general, or even extensive massacre."

Dr. Lingard has, however, carefully omitted the following passages. In their despatch to the king (Nov. 5), the lords justices say, that the rebels "had already slain very many most barbarously, hewed some to pieces, and exposed thousands to beggary, who had good estates and lived plenteously." In their commission to Lord Gormanstown, early in the same month, they speak of the rebels having "most inhumanly made destruction and devastation of the persons and estates of his majesty's good and loyal sub-

jects of this kingdom, and taken, slain, and imprisoned great numbers of them." In the proclamation issued by the king at their desire (Jan. 1, 1642), it is asserted that the rebels had "robbed and spoiled many thousands of our good subjects of the British nation, and Protestants of their goods to great values, *massacred multitudes of them*," &c. Whitelock also states, that "the miserable Englishmen, women, and children, whom the rebels took, were savagely butchered by them."

We know not what Dr. Lingard's definition of a massacre may be, but we should be inclined to apply the term to proceedings like those alluded to.

### C, page 298.

#### BATTLE OF EDGEHILL.

In order not to break the continuity of the narrative, we have reserved the following anecdotes and remarks for this place.

"Lindsey," said Sir Philip Warwick, "made a most excellent, pious, short, and soldierly prayer; for he lifted up his hands and eyes to heaven, saying, 'Oh Lord! thou knowest how busy I must be this day; if I forget thee, do not thou forget me.' And with that he rose up, crying, 'March on, boys!'"

Clarendon (*Life*, i., 160) tells us that Sir Edmund Verney, who fell in this battle, said to him about two months before, "For my part, I do not like the quarrel, and do heartily wish that the king would yield, and consent to what they desire; so that my conscience is only concerned in honour and in gratitude to follow my master. I have eaten his bread, and served him near thirty years, and will not do so base a thing as to forsake him; and choose rather to lose my life (which I am sure I shall do) to preserve and defend those things which are against my conscience to preserve and defend; for I will deal freely with you, I have no reverence for the bishops for whom this quarrel subsists." That these sentiments were shared by many honourable men, is clear from the Earl of Sunderland's letter in the Sidney Papers (ii., 667), and the Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby. Nothing can be more unjust than to represent, as is commonly done, the whole body of the royalists as a godless, profane, dissolute crew.

Ludlow (i., 42) gives the following account of the recovery of the royal standard: "I saw," said he, "Lieut. Col. Middleton, then a reformado in our army, displaying the king's standard, which he had taken. But a party of horse coming on us, we were obliged to retire with our standard; and, having brought it to the Earl of Essex, he delivered it to the custody of one Mr. Chambers, his secretary, from whom it was taken by one Captain Smith, who, with two more, disguising themselves with orange-coloured scarfs (the Earl of Essex's colours), and pretending it unfit that a penman should have the honour to carry the standard, took it from him and rode with it to the king, for which action he was knighted."

It is very doubtful what was the real number of the slain in this battle. May (p. 172) says, that in the speeches made, and books printed by both parties, "there is no consent at all concerning the number of men slain, but so great a discrepancy as it is almost a shame to insert into a history." Clarendon, Whitelock, and most others, give the number in the text, but the Duke of York, who, though a boy, was present, says (*Life of James II.*, i., 17) that, according to the best information, "there was not above 1500 bodies of both parties remaining on the field;" and Gough, in his additions to Camden's *Britannia* (ii., 333), without naming his authority, says, "by a survey made by Mr. Fisher, vicar of Keinton, by order of the Earl of Essex, the number of the slain was found not to be much above 1300." Lingard says, also naming no authority, that "the clergyman of the place, who superintended the burial of the dead, reduces it to about 1200 men." Dugdale, a contemporary, makes the number still lower. His words are (*Short View*, p. 109), "Upon strict inquiry from the adjacent inhabitants who buried the bodies, and took particular notice of the distinct numbers put into each grave, it appears that there were not 1000 complete there interred."

Clarendon asserts that two thirds of the slain were on the parliament side. May says, "Surely, by the best account, there were more slain on the king's side than the other;" and Lord Wharton assured the parliament that the loss on their side did not exceed three hundred men (*Journ.*, v., 423).

We may here observe, that it is almost impossible to get a clear idea of the exact manner in which any battle was fought in this war, or a correct estimate of the number of men slain. Neither party had any scruple about making false reports; and the parliamentary generals hardly ever owned to any but the most trifling losses, while they took care to magnify those of the enemy. Whitelock observes on a letter of the Earl of Essex, giving a very partial account of the surrender at Lostwithiel, in 1644: "By this and several other letters, we may observe how the parliament officers sought to lessen this defeat received by them, and to conceal the full truth thereof from the parliament; which is usual with some to lessen their defeats and to enlarge their victories."

Warburton (*Clarendon*, vii., 563) says, "In the year 1741, or thereabouts, I had a conversation with the Duke of Argyle and Lord Cobham (both soldiers) concerning the conduct of Essex and the king after the battle of Edgehill. They said, Essex, instead of retiring to Coventry, should either have pushed the king or attended him closely; that, since he neglected that, and went back so far north, the king should have marched hastily to London, and ended the war at a blow; that, as Lord Clarendon represents it, the conduct of both is incomprehensible. I think the matter very clear: Essex's views and principles would not suffer him to destroy the king, because the constitution would fall with him, and this he loved. . . . On the other hand, the king's best friends dreaded his ending the war by conquest, as knowing his

VOL. III.—E 2



despotic disposition. And these dissuaded the marching up to London, which Lord Clarendon tells us was debated in council." These just remarks contain the solution of many difficulties in the military history of those times.

D, page 315.

#### EVILS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

Though, as we have asserted, this civil contest was freer from atrocities than any other, it must not be supposed that none such occurred. The following extracts from May, Clarendon, and Whitelock, will give some idea of the miseries endured by the people from the violence of the soldiery on both sides at this time :

"Many towns and villages he (Rupert) plundered, that is to say, robbed (for at that time first was the word *plunder* used in England, being born in Germany, when that stately country was so miserably wasted and pillaged by foreign armies), and committed other outrages upon those who stood affected to the parliament, executing some, and hanging up servants at their masters' doors for not discovering of their masters."—May, 160. A common name for Prince Rupert, i. e. Robert, was Prince *Robber*.

Of Goring, Clarendon says (v. 138) : "So that he was forced to retire to Salisbury, where his horse committed such horrid outrages and barbarities as they had done in Hampshire, without distinction of friends or foes ; so that those parts which before were well-devoted to the king, worried by oppression, wished for the access of any forces to redeem them." He elsewhere expresses himself to the same effect.

According to the same authority (v. 203), the commissioners of Cornwall complained against Sir Richard Greenvil, "that he had committed very many honest substantial men, and all the constables of the east part of the county, to Lydford prison in Devonshire, for no offence, but to compel them to ransom themselves for money ; and that his troopers had committed such outrages in the county that they had been compelled in open sessions to declare against him, and to authorize the county, in case he should send his troops in such manner, to rise and beat them out." This, the historian observes, "was no other than a denouncing war against Greenvil." Yet he says that the discipline which Greenvil exercised over his men at Plymouth "had raised him much credit among the country people, who had lived long under the license of Prince Maurice." Whence we may infer what the conduct of that prince had been.

Whitelock is a much honest writer than Clarendon ; and he does not conceal, like him, the faults of his own party. It might therefore seem, though such was not the case, that the license was greater on the side of the parliament.

He says (p. 114), "The parliament's forces quartered at Reading, Abington, and Henley, where the rude soldiers did great mischief to friends as well as enemies in their houses, and more in

their woods; but such insolencies and mischiefs must be expected from this brood of men, or, rather, brutish soldiers, who know no difference between friends and foes, but all is plunder that they can fasten their hands upon." Again (p. 125), "A petition from Bedfordshire complains of the unruliness of the soldiers, their taking horses in markets from the country people, and then making them to redeem them again for money. The like from Sussex and Bucks, and complaining of the abusing of women and murdering of men." "These," he observes, "were the fruits of civil war, robberies, ravishings, and innumerable wicked actions committed by the barbarous soldiers, to the unspeakable misery of the poor country." Again (p. 131), "The committee reported several murders and other cruelties committed by some of the parliament's soldiers. Some of the officers grew insufferably dissolute and insolent, and their soldiers followed the example of their commanders."

The New Model, however, and, still more, the termination of the war in 1645, put an end to these enormities.

We may add Mrs. Hutchinson's account of Sir John Gell and his men :

"About this time Sir John Gell, a Derbyshire gentleman, who had been sheriff of the county at that time when the illegal tax of ship-money was exacted, and so violent in the prosecution of it, that he starved Sir John Stanhope's cattle in the pound, and would not suffer any one to relieve them there, because that worthy gentleman stood out against that unjust payment, and who had, by many aggravating circumstances, not only concerning his prosecution of Sir John Stanhope, but others, so highly misdeemed himself, that he looked for punishment from the parliament; to prevent it, very early put himself into their service, and, after the king was gone out of these countries, prevented the cavalier gentry from seizing the town of Derby, and fortified it, and raised a regiment of foot. These were good, stout fighting men, but the most licentious, ungovernable wretches that belonged to the parliament. He himself, no man knows for what reason he chose that side, for he had not understanding enough to judge the equity of the cause, nor piety or holiness, being a foul adulterer all that time he served the parliament, and so unjust that, without any remorse, he suffered his men indifferently to plunder both honest men and cavaliers. This man kept the Diurnal-makers in pension, so that whatever was done in the neighbouring counties against the enemy was attributed to him, and thus he hath indirectly [i. e., by improper means] purchased himself a name in story which he never merited, who was a very bad man, to sum up all in that word, yet an instrument of service to the parliament in those parts."—*Life of Col. Hutchinson*, p. 105.

This lady's account of Mr. Millington, Mr. Salisbury, Colonel Chadwick, Captain White, Dr. Plumtre, and the feuds in Nottingham, is also very curious as a picture of the manners of the time. "Neither was it Colonel Hutchinson's case only," she ob-

serves (p. 250) ; " almost all the parliament garrison were infested and disturbed with like factious little people, insomuch that many worthy gentlemen were wearied out of their commands, and oppressed by a certain sort [set] of mean people in the house, whom, to distinguish from the more honourable gentlemen, they called *Worsted-stocking men*."

END OF VOL. III









by the  
timer.  
Please return promptly.



